

77 03607

AN EXPERIMENT IN REGIONAL PLANNING

A History of the

Bay Area Social Planning Council




Bay Area Social Planning Council
Social reform SF Bay
Prod. with Fin. in 4

INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENTAL
STUDIES LIBRARY

JUN 29 1977

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2024 with funding from
State of California and California State Library

<https://archive.org/details/C123308565>

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENTAL
STUDIES LIBRARY
AUG 12 2024

AN EXPERIMENT IN REGIONAL PLANNING

A History of the
Bay Area Social Planning Council

Prepared By:

March 1, 1977

Martin J. Gerber
former Associate Executive Director

77 03607

INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENT
STUDIES LIBRARY

AUG 12 2024

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

DEDICATION

This document is dedicated to the memory of Mortimer Fleishhacker, founding President of the Bay Area Social Planning Council, whose leadership and counsel were instrumental in the evolvement of BASPC into a respected research and planning organization in the San Francisco Bay Area.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
FOREWORD	
I. ORIGINS OF BASPC	1
BAY AREA WELFARE PLANNING FEDERATION	1
THE SLOSS COMMITTEE REPORT	2
THE SOLOMON COMMITTEE REPORT	5
STEPS IN THE TRANSITION	10
II. THE EARLY YEARS	13
THE AGENCY STRUCTURE	14
THE FIRST YEAR	17
Key Board Decisions	19
Major Program Activities	23
OPERATING AT FULL CAPACITY: 1967-1969	23
Finances	24
Board Deliberations	27
Program Activities	31
Staff	36
III. A CHANGE IN STYLE: 1970-JUNE 1975	37
RELATIONSHIP WITH UBAC	37
Negotiations for 1971	38
Memorandum of Understanding	41
Implementation of New Directions	45

	<u>Page</u>
UBAC Liaison Committee	46
Task Force on Planning	47
ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGES	50
Structure and Style of Operation	50
Finances	55
Staff Changes	57
Program Activities	58
IV. THE FINAL MONTHS	62
RELATIONSHIP WITH UNITED WAY	63
SEEKING OUTSIDE FINANCING	68
CLOSING THE DOORS	70
V. KEY ISSUES AFFECTING BASPC	73
AFTERWORD	
BIBLIOGRAPHY	

FOREWORD

On December 31, 1976, the Bay Area Social Planning Council (BASPC) ceased to function as a viable organization. The experiment in regional social planning in the San Francisco Bay Area, envisioned in 1965 by community leaders, had come to an end - to the regret of some, the relief of others, the indifference of most of the community.

Why did the experiment fail? What went wrong? These and other questions have been, and will continue to be, raised by individuals and groups concerned with improving the human services delivery system in the Bay Area. The answers to those questions will, hopefully, serve as a basis for future efforts to plan for the orderly development of community services.

This history of BASPC was prepared because the agency's leadership recognized the importance of preserving a record of eleven years of effort to implement a new approach to health and welfare planning in the Bay Area. The document, therefore, describes the events which led to the creation, the development and the dissolution of the Bay Area Social Planning Council, and briefly discusses key issues which affected the operation of the agency. The conclusions to be drawn and the lessons to be learned from the history of the agency are left to the reader.

A generous grant by the Dayton Hudson Foundation of Minneapolis, Minnesota, on behalf of B. Dalton - Bookseller, contributed greatly to the preparation of this history.

I. ORIGINS OF BASPC

Organized efforts to plan for and coordinate the health, welfare and other human services needs in the San Francisco Bay Area community have been pursued over a period of more than 50 years. The first such effort was initiated in 1920, when the San Francisco Council of Social Agencies was established. That organization was composed of voluntary health and welfare agencies which banded together for the purpose of exchanging information, discussing mutual problems and coordinating their various services. Subsequently, councils were established in other communities within the five-county Bay Area. Some councils were county-wide in nature and others, such as the Berkeley Council, were more local in scope. The councils in the various communities evolved independently and at different rates over the next forty-odd years. By the mid-1950s, the five counties of the Bay Area were served by some 12 community councils of one type or another. County-wide organizations included: Council of Social Planning - Alameda County; Contra Costa Community Welfare Council; Marin Council of Community Services; Social Planning Committee of the United Community Fund of San Francisco; and Community Council of San Mateo County. The San Francisco planning instrument was an integral part of the united fund agency; the other four county councils were independent organizations, although all received financial support from the local united fund.

BAY AREA WELFARE PLANNING FEDERATION

Communication, cooperation and coordination among the councils were carried out on an informal basis for many years. Formal ties were established in late 1957, with creation of the Bay Area Welfare Planning Fed-

eration (BAWPF). The Federation, incorporated in December 1957, was created through the joint efforts of the five county planning councils and with the support of the United Bay Area Crusade. The constituent members consisted of the five county councils.

The Federation was the first attempt at a regional approach to community welfare planning in the Bay Area. It was, however, only an affiliation of independent county councils. It had no power to impose decisions on any of its constituent members.

The Federation was created to identify social welfare problems and to devise ways of dealing with them, either through the joint efforts of the community councils or through the efforts of individual councils. It was to conduct research and other activities which the individual councils were not in a position to carry out on their own. It also was to provide assistance to the United Bay Area Crusade (UBAC) in its budgeting and allocations process and in the determination of admission of new agencies. Funding for the organization was received from UBAC. Small amounts were granted for 1958 and 1959; \$60,000 was allocated for 1960, the first year of full operation of the agency.

THE SLOSS COMMITTEE REPORT

In late 1962, UBAC's President notified the Federation that part of its allocation for 1963 was to be held in reserve and would be released contingent upon evaluation of the operation of the Federation. Such evaluation had been recommended by the UBAC Board of Directors in June 1959, when the allocation for the Federation's first full year of operation was being considered. The evaluation was conducted by a committee

of eight persons, all of whom were experienced in agency operation, in planning and in fund raising activities. Chairman of the Study Committee on Bay Area Planning was Frank H. Sloss, a San Francisco attorney.

The Committee initiated a thorough and extensive study of the Federation, in order (1) to make immediate recommendations with respect to continued financing of the Bay Area Welfare Planning Federation, and, (2) to study the question of the coordination of the Federation with the several county social planning organizations. In an interim report, the Committee recommended continued funding of the Federation, but concluded that the Federation was not fully serving the function that it might and ought to serve. The Committee, therefore, continued its work, focusing on what could and should be done to make social planning for the Bay Area more effective.

On August 21, 1964, the Committee submitted its final report, entitled Report and Recommendations to the [UBAC] Executive Committee. The report states in part that ". . . while there is a definite need for Bay Area social planning services, the presently stated purposes of the Federation are too broadly expressed to be readily accomplished. Its present form of organization and its resources make it incapable of real coordination or of exercising effective administrative control of the social planning activities in the Bay Area, if that were determined to be desired. We expect direct service agencies to have a rational form of organization to render effective services; the same standards must apply to Bay Area planning." The Committee stated further that "In its present form and constituency, . . . the Federation lacks the authority and resources to accomplish some of the functions which have been expected of it. We believe

that it is unrealistic to expect an effective and coordinated Bay Area approach to many problems with the kinds of ties that currently bind these six organizations together. Complete local autonomy no longer fits the circumstances. A Bay Area planning organization needs enough authority to establish effective areawide policies on areawide subjects. We do not see change as necessarily weakening the county planning service; they should in fact be strengthened through having new resources available to them."

The Committee, in presenting its recommendations, stated, "Social planning clearly implies action. Research, citizen participation and public interpretation should result in changes which make the Bay Area a better community in which to live. Anything less is wasteful of the human and material resources which are devoted to social planning objectives." Its basic recommendation stated: "There is a clear need for a Bay Area social planning organization. It should act as the focal point for an effective, flexible and economical means for expressing the need for change and improvement in the Bay Area and its constituent communities, with particular focus on the organized social services which serve the people. It should be effective in mobilizing the evidence and citizen interest on the problems at hand; it should be capable of outlining solutions which effectively tackle the problem; it should be economical in using the available financial and human resources needed to translate the plans into action; it should be independent and autonomous. Such an organization would need a community-wide constituency to which it is answerable, whether it is organizational or individual in composition, not confined to the county social planning agencies, which are the present sole

constituency of the Bay Area Welfare Planning Federation."

The Committee went on to present specific recommendations dealing with the function, organization and finances of a regional agency. Its final recommendation on finances stated: "Regardless of the sources of support, the method of financing must be such as to leave the planning body independent and ultimately responsible to the community as a whole."

THE SOLOMON COMMITTEE REPORT

In 1963, while the Sloss Committee was at work, the President's Council of UBAC, acting in concert with the presidents of the social planning organizations in the five counties of the Bay Area, initiated steps to conduct a survey of federated financing and community planning for health and welfare in the Bay Area. The study was authorized by the Executive Committee of UBAC on November 26, 1963, and had the affirmation of the affiliated organizations and the endorsement of the 13 organizations involved in social planning, budgeting and federated fund raising in the five counties. The study was conducted under the auspices of a citizens' committee, with the aid of an outside study group from United Community Funds and Councils of America (UCFCA). The Citizens Survey Committee was composed of persons from industry, business, labor, religion, law and medicine. It included persons representing the organizations which were to be evaluated. Chairman of the Committee was Emmett G. Solomon, President of Crocker National Bank.

The major premise of the study was that segmented structures responsible for fund raising, budgeting and planning are ineffectual. The objectives of the study, therefore, were: (1) to plan the orderly develop-

ment of public and voluntary services to meet the need as efficiently as possible in all parts of the five-county area; (2) to adequately finance essential voluntary services; and (3) to allocate funds raised according to the relative importance and effectiveness of services within the entire five-county area.

The study was initiated in November 1964 and continued through the first part of 1965. It was carried out in a thorough and comprehensive fashion and included: the organization of panels covering major functions; the creation of technical advisory groups; communication among boards of organizations involved; meetings with community leadership; and the use of questionnaires, interviews and reports to obtain data and opinions from various sources. Questionnaires were distributed to more than 500 social welfare agencies in the five counties, to more than 100 citizen leaders, and to more than 100 executives of businesses and corporations.

On July 26, 1965, the final report of the Committee was completed. The report, entitled Appraisal of Federated Financing and Community Planning for Health and Welfare in the Bay Area, presented recommendations dealing with social planning, with budgeting and with UBAC structure and campaign.

In examining the independent social planning organizations in the Bay Area, the Committee found that:

These five county social planning bodies tend to be isolated. There are great variations among them in organization, program and resources. There is very little unity among these local planning efforts.

The organizational structure of these councils tend to be complex and cumbersome. This is particularly true in San Francisco

and Alameda County. It results in an excessive application of volunteer and staff time just to keep the organization and the structure going.

Many excellent volunteer leaders are involved in the County Councils, but the overall image is not one of having the most influential community leadership. There is a noticeable lack of leadership from labor, business and industry . . . The planning operation must have the active participation of leaders of stature, ability, and influence from business, occupational, religious and racial groups in the community.

The Bay Area Welfare Planning Federation has made very limited progress in bringing about a unified effort for the Bay Area as a whole. It has provided some research tools and some agency standards which have been useful to all of the local Councils. It has done very little in the way of program development on a Bay Area basis. Actually, it is limited in its purposes, its authority, and its financing. For these reasons it has been unable to give the leadership required for community planning in the Bay Area.

A notable deficiency in the system of social planning in the Bay Area has been the negligible influence of social planning upon the financing of voluntary agencies. With the exception of San Francisco, the county councils have had little relationship to the budgeting done by the county United Funds, although there were some developments in this direction during the past year or two. The Bay Area Welfare Planning Federation has also been limited in its influence but it did an excellent job of providing pertinent information to the UBAC Budget and Allocations Committee this past year. Budgeting and planning should be closely interrelated. This has not happened to a significant degree in the Bay Area, the fragmentation of budgeting and planning activities being one important reason for this failure.

The size, complexity, and growth of health, welfare and recreation services in the Bay Area present a tremendous challenge to social planning. There is a dire need for effective citizen direction of developments in this field. The citizens of this area should control their own destiny and ought to have the means for influencing, in the interest of the total community, the forces which come in from outside and the decision making by literally hundreds of local groups. The present pattern of leadership, structure, staffing, programming and financing is inadequate to do the job.¹

The Citizens Committee presented seven recommendations dealing with social planning in the Bay Area. Its first and most basic recommendation

¹/ Appraisal of Federated Financing and Community Planning for Health and Welfare in the Bay Area, July 26, 1965, pp. 3-4.

was

. . . THAT A NEW BAY AREA COUNCIL FOR SOCIAL PLANNING BE ORGANIZED, WITH COUNTY (OR DISTRICT) COUNCILS IN EACH OF THE FIVE COUNTIES, TO REPLACE THE PRESENT BAY AREA WELFARE PLANNING FEDERATION AND THE FIVE INDEPENDENT PLANNING BODIES. EACH OF THESE EXISTING ORGANIZATIONS SHOULD NAME THE BAY AREA COUNCIL FOR SOCIAL PLANNING AS ITS SUCCESSOR ORGANIZATION. LEGAL STEPS AND OTHER NECESSARY SAFEGUARDS SHOULD BE TAKEN TO HONOR ALL COMMITMENTS INCLUDING EXISTING CONTRACTS AND USE OF RESTRICTED FUNDS.²

It was the view of the Committee that a strong independent regional organization, with local county divisions integrated into its structure, would give welfare planning the posture, stature, scope of operation, competence and influence required to meet the challenges in the large, complex and growing business of health and social welfare in the Bay Area. Such an organization would, among other things: challenge and attract community leadership; provide a quality of professional staff service that could not be duplicated in each county, and a flexibility in the use of staff to allow more efficient use of various staff talents; facilitate tackling some of the massive difficult welfare problems; enable welfare planning to relate to other regional organizations in the Bay Area, as well as with local organizations concerned with physical, economic and educational needs of the community; provide a stronger research base for planning than is possible through five independent and local planning bodies; and provide an objectivity that is essential to be a helpful resource to funding bodies. Specific suggestions were made about planning at the county levels, structure of the organization, and its program and operation.

The second recommendation of the Committee was that the Council provide service to UBAC on program matters. "BACSP would be the planning

2/ Ibid, p. 9.

partner of UBAC, assisting it with factual data, studies, consultation, and community opinion - both Baywide and local - as UBAC undertakes its difficult tasks of establishing financial and program goals, formulating policies, admitting new agencies, and budgeting."³

The Committee also suggested: that governmental and voluntary agencies participate in the Council at both the regional and at the county levels; that operation of district or neighborhood councils have a lower priority than program planning and development; that the internal structure of the agency, at both the regional and county levels, be kept as simple as possible; that program emphases be carefully controlled; and that an adequate and highly qualified staff is essential to the success of the council. In dealing with program emphases, the Committee stated:

The scope of health and social welfare needs and problems is almost limitless. Most requests for study, coordination, research, promotion, community education coming to a planning council usually have merit. But the planning unit never will have sufficient resources to undertake all requests. Therefore greater centralization and control of program emphases and priorities is essential if the entire operation is not to become over-extended and its impact minimized because it is not concentrating on specifically determined objectives.

Further,

Demonstration projects are a significant part of the present county planning bodies programs, and should continue to be so. However, the planning body must not become primarily a holding company for the operation of demonstrations, thereby tending to replace or interfere with the basic planning job.⁴

Finally, the Committee recommended that the new organization be staffed with a team of 28 professional persons and 28 secretarial and clerical persons. A budget of approximately \$600,000 per year was suggested,

3/ Ibid, p. 17

4/ Ibid, p. 20

with the basic budget to be provided by UBAC. The Committee stated, however, that the Council should also look to governmental bodies for support, both for ongoing operations and for special projects.

STEPS IN THE TRANSITION

The recommendations of the Solomon Committee were reviewed and adopted in principle by the leadership of both the United Fund and the planning organizations in the Bay Area. Procedures for establishing the regional planning council, as well as UBAC, were undertaken during the latter part of 1965. The procedures followed the recommendations of a special committee appointed by the Chairman of the Citizens Survey Committee. The Committee to Recommend Implementation Procedures had developed a timetable which called for establishment of the new organizations by January 1, 1966. It further recommended⁵ that separate Organization and Implementation Committees be established, one to deal with creation of the regional fund-raising and budgeting organization, the other with creation of the regional planning agency. The latter Committee was composed of nine persons - one person named by the president of each of the county planning organizations, two persons named by the President of the Federation, one person named by the President of UBAC and a chairman appointed by the Chairman of the Citizens Survey Committee.

The Organization and Implementation Committee concerned with regional planning was given latitude in its work, so long as certain essential elements were assured, namely:

5/ Report of the Committee to Recommend Implementation Procedures to the Citizens Survey Committee, Appendix to Solomon Committee Report.

- that there be one incorporated body for Bay Area social planning;
- that the planning councils in the five counties dissolve as separate corporations, naming the regional planning council as their successor;
- that there be built-in provisions for productive working relationships between UBAC and the planning council, particularly in budgeting;
- that organization of the Council include
 - a. built-in provisions for representation from each of the five counties on the governing body and on major committees
 - b. authority of the Executive Director to employ and deploy staff
 - c. outlining of functions to be delegated to the county councils, with assurance to the county councils of latitude in carrying out those functions within budgetary and staff assignments for the county councils agreed upon annually
 - d. provision for continuous review and adjustment of the respective responsibilities of central and county-based staffs
 - e. provision for agency participation in development of policy.

By December 1965, formation of the new regional planning council was well under way. Articles of Incorporation for the Bay Area Council for Social Planning were adopted on December 15, 1965. Thereafter, activities

were undertaken to complete the organizational structure and to commence operation of the new agency.

In the meantime, the Federation and the planning councils in the five counties initiated steps to dissolve their respective corporations. On January 6, 1966, the Federation's Board of Directors approved a resolution to take all steps necessary to dissolve that corporation. By May 26, procedures for dissolution had been completed.

Dissolution of the respective county and local planning organizations proceeded at varying speeds. Some of the local councils expressed concern that the creation of the regional agency would result in loss of local autonomy. And several area councils in Alameda County attempted, unsuccessfully, to secure assurance from the new corporation that staffing patterns for their councils would be maintained, and that the funds held by the councils would be used solely for program activities in the respective areas without reducing BASPC's financial investment in services for those areas. Nevertheless, by June 1966, most of the predecessor organizations had completed dissolution of their corporations. The Contra Costa County Council for Community Services remained in existence for three more years in order to serve as fiscal agent for two federal projects in that County that the leadership of the new agency declined to operate. The area councils eventually disbanded and turned their assets over to the regional Council; only the Berkeley Council declined to take such action and remained a separate entity, albeit without measurable viability.

Thus, the groundwork was laid for launching the new experiment in regional planning.

II. THE EARLY YEARS

The Bay Area Council for Social Planning (from the outset referred to as BASPC) was established officially on December 15, 1965, with adoption of Articles of Incorporation. The Articles of Incorporation describe the purposes of the organization, as follows:

1. The specific and primary purpose for which this corporation is formed is to provide a vehicle by which the people of the Bay Area can determine their health, welfare and recreation needs and plan the orderly development of resources to meet those needs.

2. Its general purposes are:

- (a) To work for the prevention and elimination of conditions which cause social and health problems;

- (b) To promote quality, efficiency, and coordination in the provision of health, recreation and welfare services;

- (c) To foster public understanding of health, recreation and welfare needs and services;

--- and thereby to enrich life in the San Francisco Bay area counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Francisco and San Mateo, and such other counties as may hereafter join in the activities of this corporation.

In keeping with the recommendations of the Committee to Recommend Implementation Procedures, an Organization and Implementation Committee was appointed to take steps necessary to launch the required planning agency. Under the leadership of its Chairman, Don Fazackerly, the Committee conducted a search for an Executive Director and prepared Bylaws governing the structure and operation of the agency. The Bylaws were adopted by the Committee on January 3, 1966.

THE AGENCY STRUCTURE

The BASPC Bylaws provided for a Council membership of 250 persons, to be selected ". . . on the basis of their leadership, knowledge and concern for community planning of health, social welfare and recreation services, drawn from all parts of the Bay Area and from each of the major segments of its community life."⁶ Of the 250 corporate members, 150 were to be selected by the existing planning councils in each of the five counties; the 30 members named by each County Council were to constitute the board of that County Council. The remaining 100 members were to be chosen initially by an organizing committee and were identified as members at large. All members were to serve three-year terms, with provision for one-third of the terms to expire each year. Vacancies or expiring terms of County Council members were to be filled by the respective Councils. The BASPC Nominating Committee was given responsibility for recommending candidates for members at large.

The Council's Board of Directors was to consist of 45 persons: the chairman of each of the five County Councils; one person selected by each of the County Councils for a two-year term; five persons to be chosen by the UBAC Board for three-year terms; and 30 members to be elected by the membership for staggered three-year terms. Service on the Board was limited to six consecutive years.

Officers of the corporation were to include President, who was also to serve as Chairman of the Board, such vice presidents as the Board determined to be needed, Secretary, and Treasurer. The officers were to be elected annually by the corporate membership.

^{6/} Bylaws of the Bay Area Council for Social Planning, Article II, Section 1, January 6, 1966.

The Board was given responsibility for managing the affairs of the agency. An Executive Director was to be employed to carry out the policies and programs of the corporation under the general direction of the Board. The Director was given the authority to employ and deploy staff, with the understanding that the principal staff person in each county was to be assigned after consultation with that County Council.

The Bylaws provided for five specific standing committees and operating divisions: Central Planning and Development Division, Local Planning and Development Division, Budget and Finance, Personnel, and Public Information. Provision was made for other standing committees as the Board might authorize, and special committees as needed. The President of the corporation was empowered to appoint committee members and chairpersons, to determine the number of members of a committee, its length of service, and its duties and powers, subject to Board approval.

The Central Planning and Development Division and the Local Planning and Development Division were concerned with determining the program of the agency. The Central Planning and Development Division was assigned responsibility for: research and studies; planning and development projects and legislative, fiscal and program matters relating to more than one county; assistance and consultation to the County Councils and to governmental and voluntary social, educational and planning agencies; special projects and demonstrations; public relations and coordination of agencies and area-wide services; and selected common services. It also was to screen regional program requests and establish priorities.

The Local Planning and Development Division was to be comprised of up to 22 members, two persons selected annually by the Chairman of each

County Council and up to 12 citizens at large, selected annually by the President of the corporation. Duties of this Division were ". . . to coordinate, correlate and clear program proposals and recommendations to the Board of Directors, to establish priorities among proposed local programs, to observe and improve the relationships between the Board of Directors and the Council, and to evaluate the activities carried on within each county by its County Council."⁷

Finally, the Bylaws directed that a County Council was to be established in each of the five counties ". . . to provide a depth of sensitivity, involvement, support and flexibility in carrying out the purposes of this corporation in our complex and extensive Bay Area, and to find, consider and attend to areas of local health, welfare and recreation concern, need and change."⁸ The County Councils were to operate within the broad policy and program goals set by the Board of Directors. They were empowered:

To pursue such health, welfare or recreational projects, studies, demonstrations and experiments, of concern to the county or part thereof, as it may choose, in any manner not specifically proscribed by the board of directors, including studies of problems, services and agencies, public and private.

To develop plans for improving and to act on legislative, fiscal or program matters of concern to the county or a part thereof.

To provide assistance and consultation to local governmental and voluntary agencies and organizations.

To conduct informational and educational activities.

To recommend to the Central Planning and Development Division studies and actions on issues and problems of concern to more

7/ Ibid, Article VII, Section 5, January 6, 1966.

8/ Ibid, Article VI, Section 1.

than one county in the San Francisco Bay Area.⁹

The board of each County Council was to consist of 30 members, including a Chairman who was to serve as a Vice President of the corporation. Each board member, by virtue of his membership, was to be a member of the corporation. Each of the Councils was given autonomy as to the manner in which members were to be nominated and elected and the principles and rules by which it was to conduct its affairs. These procedures were to be set forth in a formalized set of Guiding Principles and Rules of Procedure subject to approval by the Board of Directors. The membership of each of the local councils was to be representative of direct service agencies and civic organizations and was to include a substantial number of citizens at large.

THE FIRST YEAR

The BASPC Board of Directors met for the first time on January 7, 1966. Mortimer Fleishhacker, Jr., selected as temporary Chairman by the Board, presided. The Board approved appointment of Paul Akana as Executive Director, effective February 1, 1966, and authorized him to begin recruitment of staff, with the stipulation that first consideration be given to staff members of existing councils. The selection of officers of the corporation and other organization matters were completed at the Board meeting on February 23, 1966. At that time, the Board also adopted a budget of \$633,280 for the calendar year.

Recruitment of staff for the organization proceeded during February and March of 1966. By the end of March the majority of the staff posi-

9/ Ibid, Article VI, Section 2.

tions had been filled. Full scale operation of the agency commenced on April 1, 1966. By that date four of the five county council operations were in place. In Alameda County, planning activities under BASPC did not commence until mid-year, when the predecessor organization took formal action to dissolve.

The majority of the staff had been selected from the predecessor organizations. Several of the staff were recruited from other organizations in the Bay Area or from other areas. Directors of the predecessor councils in Contra Costa and Marin Counties continued in their positions within the new organization. New County Directors were named for the other three counties.

The agency initiated program activities with a staff complement of 27 professional and 20 clerical persons. Staff were deployed throughout six offices - the BASPC headquarters in Oakland and an office in each of the five counties comprising the service area. Each county office was managed by a County Director. Other professional staff, known as planning consultants, were deployed to the county offices as follows: three each in Alameda County and in San Francisco; two in San Mateo County; and one in Contra Costa County. The headquarters staff, in addition to the Director and Associate Director, consisted of: a research director and two research consultants; an information and referral service director and two consultants; a program director and two planning consultants; a general consultant; and a public relations director.

During the period January-May 1966, BASPC received financial support from UBAC on a month-to-month basis. In May, the BASPC Board approved a budget calling for expenditures of \$383,121 for the period June-December

1966. Most of this amount represented funds from UBAC which had been originally set aside for allocation to the predecessor organizations.

As early as October 1966, the Board discussed potential sources of financing other than UBAC. The minutes of the Board meeting of October 4, 1966, state that "There was some discussion of the need for BASPC to explore financing from counties other than San Francisco. After some discussion, consensus was reached that the BASPC president be authorized to approach other counties for financing BASPC operations on a continuing subsidy basis."

Key Board Decisions

From the outset of the BASPC work, Board meetings included discussion of the nature and style of operation of the agency. For example, in May 1966, the Board approved a recommendation that high priority be given to selected regional projects. At that meeting Board members expressed concern about such action, pointing out that predecessor organizations had agreed to establishment of a regional agency on the grounds that local services would be improved. Concern also was expressed that the special projects, initiated prior to the advent of BASPC, be continued. Further, there appeared to be differing views about the role and functions of County Councils within BASPC.

On August 9, 1966, the BASPC Board adopted three documents dealing with policies and operations of the agency - a policy statement regarding positions on public issues, a statement on the suggested structure of County Councils, and a policy statement on special grant projects.

1. Policy on Public Issues

This document was designed to provide the Board and the County Councils with a guide as to when, to what extent and under what circumstances BASPC or any of its instrumentalities should take a public position on a given issue. It was based on the following assumptions: that a disciplined, discriminating and properly timed approach to speaking on public issues is essential for an organization which truly wishes to influence public policy and practice; that a position taken by any part of the organization is inevitably identified by the public as a position taken by the organization as a whole; that the object of the position taking is to effect a desired result rather than to acquire a reputation; and that the impact of a position on a public issue is related to recognition that the issue is within the organization's area of competence.

The policy statement identified the BASPC area of competence as the field of social welfare services. Six criteria were identified for determining the appropriateness for position taking on a given public issue, namely: that the issue is within the BASPC area of competence; that it is nonpartisan; that it is nonpersonal; that it is of sufficient importance and concern to merit the attention of BASPC; that it had substantial agreement within BASPC about it; and that the BASPC position would make a difference in effecting results.

The approach to the development of a position was to include gathering of facts - statistics, evidence from comparable situations elsewhere, all positions both pro and con, the consequences of any course of action - and workable alternatives, including methods of implementation and appropriate timing.

The provisions of the policy statement were to apply to the County Councils in developing positions on local issues, and to the BASPC Board in considering positions on issues of broader scope.

2. Suggested Internal Structure for County Councils

This document was developed as a guideline for County Council operations. It stated that each County Council is responsible for determining its own structure and operating procedures, consistent with the policies of BASPC, as described in the Bylaws. The document contains suggestions to help the County Councils develop guiding principles. It was pointed out, for example, that since BASPC is a single entity with several operating instrumentalities, the local Council need not retain the customary management paraphernalia, such as standing committees of a housekeeping nature. Rather, the County Council as a whole could make decisions on recommendations of ad hoc committees, appointed as needed by the Council Chairman. It was further suggested that the County Councils maintain some degree of consistency in their respective internal structures - that the Councils meet monthly as a committee of the whole; that most Council activities be conducted through ad hoc committees that have specified tasks and time limited existence; that a nominating committee and a program committee be established; that the terms of the Council officers and members be established on a rotating basis, with specified terms and limitations on terms of officers; and that elections and appointments be held annually in May.

3. Policy on Special Grant Projects

This document was developed because of the recognized need for an orderly approach to the sponsorship and/or operation of special grant

projects. At the time that the policy statement was adopted, BASPC was operating 33 projects representing \$1,674,947 in grants for the year. Of the 33 projects under Council auspices, 23 were scheduled for termination during 1966, eight during 1967, one in 1968 and one in 1969; all of the projects had been initiated by the predecessor organizations.

The policy statement cautioned that, while the availability of increasing funds from various sources for experimentation, for demonstration and for new programs could contribute greatly to the furtherance of the Council's primary purpose, projects and services might be developed in line with a granting agency's particular interest, rather than on the basis of community needs. Project proposals, therefore, should be directed toward needs recognized by knowledgeable local leadership. The policy states that "As a general principle, special grant projects undertaken by the Bay Area Social Planning Council should result from its knowledge of the social concerns and problems of the Bay Area. Furthermore, the projects should ordinarily be for research and planning and not for direct services."¹⁰ Decisions to undertake a project were to be made by the Board, and several factors were identified as the basis for Board decisions regarding projects.

The Board of Directors also recognized the need to secure financial support from county governments. At its meeting on October 4, 1966, the Board authorized BASPC's President to approach county governments regarding financing of BASPC operations on a continuing subsidy basis.

Finally, the Board recognized the need to examine its role and func-

10/ Policy on Special Grant Projects, August 1966.

tion in the health services field, particularly in light of activities conducted by the Bay Area Health Facilities Planning Association. An ad hoc committee was appointed ". . . to help the Board determine BASPC's proper course of action in fulfilling its planning and coordination responsibilities in the health field . . ."11

Major Program Activities

The program of BASPC initially consisted of activities that had been initiated by the various predecessor organizations. Such activities included studies and consultations, projects and other planning, coordinating and implementation efforts. In addition, BASPC staff assisted UBAC budget panels in their deliberations regarding allocations to member agencies.

The first major project initiated under the auspices of the new organization was a study of San Francisco General Hospital. The study, requested by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in the spring of 1966, was completed in August with publication of a report containing recommendations regarding the continued use of the facility as a teaching hospital, and the granting of staff privileges to general practitioners.

In August of 1966, the Board authorized the commencement of two regional studies - one dealing with problems of unmarried mothers, particularly those who keep their children; and the problem of low-income families ineligible for public assistance.

OPERATING AT FULL CAPACITY: 1967-1969

The 1966 calendar year was spent primarily in making BASPC a fully

11/ Minutes, BASPC Board of Directors Meeting, October 4, 1966.

operational organization. Most of the time of the Board was devoted to the organization and structure of the agency. In addition, staff was occupied with activities which had been in progress initially under the auspices of the predecessor organizations. The year 1967 marked the first full year of BASPC operation. During the next three years, through the end of 1969, BASPC's early years, the Board continued to deal with issues of significance to the structure and operation of BASPC. At the same time, a distinct BASPC program and style evolved as activities initiated under predecessor organizations terminated.

Finances

In its first full year of operation, the BASPC budget amounted to \$633,613. The bulk of the funds to pay for expenditures came from UBAC, which allocated a total of \$568,000 to BASPC for calendar 1967. BASPC had originally requested an allocation of some \$586,000 from UBAC but had been informed that the allocation was to be set at \$546,000. The lower figure was based on the fact that (a) changes in the rental and telephone charges at the San Francisco and Alameda County offices of BASPC would result in an \$8,000 reduction in expenditures; and (b) BASPC was to receive an allocation of \$32,000 from the County of San Mateo for calendar 1967. BASPC also was informed that the allocation would be reduced by an additional \$30,000 to offset an amount which was anticipated from San Francisco County government for operation of district councils in that community; however, BASPC withdrew its request for those funds because the agency decided not to continue to operate district councils.

The BASPC Board responded to the UBAC action by stating that ". . . it is understood that BASPC will be unable to provide the kind of

planning activities which had been envisioned in the Citizens' Survey Committee report of 1964-65, without additional funds. The fact that, as BASPC starts its 1967 operations, there has actually been a reduction from a minimum amount budgeted clearly results in a serious effect on BASPC's capacity to provide the services presumably desired by the Bay Area community."¹²

During the early part of 1967, representatives of BASPC and UBAC conferred about the BASPC allocation for 1967. The UBAC allocation was subsequently increased to \$568,000. That allocation, in addition to a commitment from the County of San Mateo of approximately \$32,000 per year, permitted BASPC to retain the budget originally approved by the Board.

In addition to the report on the UBAC allocation, the BASPC Board was informed ". . . that UBAC leadership has accepted, in principle, the concept that UBAC will provide a basic subsidy for planning activities in the Bay Area, which will not necessarily be increased or decreased with the acquisition of funds from sources other than UBAC. This means that, while UBAC will continue to examine BASPC's budget requests each year and make allocations according to the justification of BASPC's request and UBAC's ability to provide funds, it will be possible for BASPC to seek funds, particularly from county governments, with the assurance that such county funds will not result in corresponding reductions in UBAC support."¹³

BASPC continued to receive the same allocation from UBAC - \$568,000 - during 1968 and 1969. In addition, financial support was

12/ Minutes, BASPC Board Meeting, January 17, 1967.

13/ Minutes, BASPC Board Meeting, March 7, 1967.

received from the County of San Mateo (some \$32,000 per year) and from The San Francisco Foundation (\$15,000 per year). In preparing a budget for 1969, the Treasurer of BASPC projected a deficit of almost \$67,000. It was reported ". . . that the deficit is occasioned by increased costs, particularly in payroll, unmatched by increased income. From the outset, BASPC has attempted to receive sustaining funds from county governments. To date, San Mateo County is the only financial supporter of BASPC's work. Attempts are already being made to obtain support from the other four counties in BASPC's service area. It is hoped that such attempts will be sufficiently successful to eliminate the projected deficit. It is understood, however, that, should no additional income materialize in 1969, it will be necessary for expenditures to be reduced, beginning about the middle of the year."¹⁴

Subsequently, a balanced budget of approximately \$673,000 was adopted. Balancing of the budget was made possible by unanticipated carryover funds and by taking steps to reduce expenses, such as moving the Alameda County office to the BASPC headquarters building, and reducing to the minimum the publication of the agency's newsletter.

The Board recognized the implications of the budget for 1969. Mention was made of the fact that ". . . unless new sources of income are found, it will not be possible for BASPC to continue to operate on its present scale. The only reason it is able to do so (with the above economies) is that it has a backlog of funds which primarily represent legacies from predecessor organizations. These funds will presumably be

¹⁴/ Minutes, BASPC Board Meeting, November 8, 1968.

exhausted by the end of 1969. As a consequence, BASPC will be facing the necessity of effecting drastic cuts in its program in 1970 unless additional income is forthcoming. The major hope of developing such additional income is through the county governments, in addition to San Mateo."¹⁵ The Board re-emphasized the need to generate other sources of funds by adopting a resolution urging the County Councils in the four counties other than San Mateo to make every effort during 1969 to obtain funds from their respective county governments.

Board Deliberations

During the period 1967-1969, the BASPC Board dealt with a number of significant organizational and policy matters. The first such matter was a report of the Health Mission Committee, appointed by the Board in late 1966 to develop a statement on the role of BASPC in the field of health services. On January 17, 1967, the Board adopted the recommendations of the Committee. One major recommendation was that BASPC ". . . continue to operate on a problem-solving basis and to deal with categories of the population which require community attention - encompassing in the process all services and needs in the health and welfare field. In this light, the target for BASPC's problem solving would be the possessors of the problem in question in any given instance." The Committee also suggested that BASPC continue to engage in health planning, ". . . broadening such health planning activities, as necessary, in the future."

Adoption of the recommendations of the Health Mission Committee was important, not only because it restated the interest of BASPC in the

^{15/} Minutes, BASPC Board Meeting, March 4, 1969.

health planning arena, but because it acknowledged officially that BASPC operated basically on a problem-solving basis, rather than by examining comprehensive fields of service. In discussing this matter, some Board members expressed the view that BASPC has the responsibility not only to put out fires and deal with specific problems, but to develop community policies on health and welfare.

Later in the year, the Board approved a memorandum of understanding and a joint statement with the Bay Area Health Facilities Planning Association. The joint statement indicated:

It is recognized by these two voluntary organizations that their respective responsibilities are compatible and complementary. In the interest of strengthening the programs of the two organizations, and, through them, enhancing the activities of other organizations in the health and welfare field, the Bay Area Social Planning Council and the Bay Area Health Facilities Planning Association pledge themselves to continue their planning efforts on a cooperative basis.¹⁶

The Board dealt with a key issue related to the style of operation of BASPC when, in October 1967, it refused a request from the San Francisco Council to ". . . assign consecutive staff time throughout the ensuing year to comprehensive health planning in San Francisco, sufficient to assure the continued existence and effectiveness under BASPC's auspices of the program of the San Francisco Health Council." (The Health Council was one of the field of service councils which operated under the predecessor organization and which continued in existence during the formative years of BASPC.) The request reflected a continuing problem within the agency regarding the style of operation, the deployment of staff and the autonomy of the local Councils. In responding to the San Francisco

^{16/} Minutes, BASPC Board Meeting, April 12, 1967.

Council, the Board stated in part that ". . . staff assignments have been made according to the current concept of problem-focused activities on the part of BASPC and all of its instrumentalities" and ". . . until fundamental policies are changed, BASPC will continue to operate in this manner." The intent of this position was to urge the San Francisco Health Council to ". . . stop worrying about structure and get into what the Health Council wants to do. Unfortunately, the discussions, prior to the resolution of the question in the Local and Regional Program Committee, had been overly concerned with the perpetuation of the particular structure and independent entity desired by the San Francisco Health Council."¹⁷ The Health Council eventually withdrew from BASPC.

In December 1967, the Board approved relatively minor revisions in the Bylaws. However, earlier discussion of the Bylaws revisions and the process by which they were reviewed indicated continuing concern within the organization of the respective roles and functions of the County Councils and the Board. Recommendations of the Bylaws Review Committee were originally submitted to the Board with a recommendation that the Board approve the changes and that those changes be submitted to the County Councils for reactions, with such reactions transmitted to the Committee for screening and presentation to the Board. Two points of view were expressed about this procedure. On the one hand, it was pointed out that proposed Bylaws revisions should be given thorough consideration by the County Councils before being acted upon by the Board. On the other hand, it was stated that BASPC is governed by one body, the Board of

¹⁷/ Minutes, BASPC Board Meeting, October 3, 1967.

Directors, which has the power to amend its own rules. The discussion revealed that the Board members agreed not to make this matter a major issue. As a compromise, the Board "accepted" the report of the Committee for transmittal to the County Councils for review and comment prior to Board action.

A key policy decision was made by the BASPC Board early in 1968. At its April meeting, the Local and Regional Program Committee reported that UBAC had requested BASPC to provide staff services to UBAC's New Directions Committee; the Committee was to evaluate UBAC's role in financing health and welfare services. The Program Committee recognized the importance of the proposed study but was of the view that the scope contemplated would produce results of limited usefulness. More importantly, the Committee concluded that the proposed staffing pattern was not acceptable ". . . since BASPC is not an integral part of UBAC, and BASPC, by policy and practice, does not loan staff to other agencies . . ."¹⁸ The Board accepted the Program Committee's recommendations and directed BASPC officers and staff to initiate discussions with UBAC leading to BASPC's appropriate involvement in a project of sufficient scale to deal with the issue of concern to UBAC.

The action by the Board of Directors on this matter represented the first official affirmation of a heretofore informal policy - the loaning of staff to other agencies.

In September 1968, the Board again was asked to deal with an issue related to the role and function of County Councils and local ver-

^{18/} Minutes, BASPC Board Meeting, April 10, 1968.

sus regional activities. During the previous summer, BASPC's Executive Committee had considered concerns about staffing and program activities at the local level. On September 10, 1968, the Board adopted the following recommendations of the Committee:

1. That it should be the stated policy of BASPC that each County Council has permanently assigned to it a County Director whose activities are determined by the activities of the County Council to which he is assigned . . .
2. That the Local and Regional Program Committee should give higher priority than heretofore to local projects and programs, within the framework of accepted BASPC policies and practices.
3. That, accordingly, such staff as might be necessary to assist County Directors in the carrying out of such local projects should be deployed to the extent available.

The first Board action related to fee charging took place early in 1969. Occasionally, BASPC staff services were requested by consultant firms and by organizations with special grant monies to conduct studies. BASPC's Executive Director was of the opinion that, in such circumstances, fees might be justified. On March 4, 1969, the Budget and Finance Committee recommended that the Board adopt the principle of fee charging, with the understanding ". . . that such a policy would not be formulated for the purpose of generating income, but rather for the purpose of protecting staff time from possible inappropriate use by profit-making enterprises." The Board authorized the drafting of such a policy. It was not until a year and a half later that a fee policy was adopted; that policy was not designed to "protect" staff, but to "generate income."

Program Activities

During the period 1967-1969, BASPC conducted formal studies of

social problems at the local and regional levels, provided consultation and advice to public and private human services agencies, and operated an information and referral service for the five-county Bay Area. In addition, BASPC continued to act as fiscal agent for a number of grant projects that had been initiated by its predecessors, and provided a field work setting for students in social welfare and public health programs.

Program activities of a regional nature were determined by the Local and Regional Program Committee (formerly the Central and Local Planning and Development Divisions). The County Councils were responsible for decisions regarding program activities within their respective jurisdictions. The County Councils also were responsible for approving reports and recommendations resulting from local studies. Originally, all reports were transmitted to the BASPC Board for approval; later the Board limited its actions to endorsement of local reports, leaving formal approval to the appropriate County Council.

BASPC also was involved extensively in providing services to UBAC. For example, BASPC conducted admission studies requested by UBAC. Also, during UBAC's annual budget deliberations, several BASPC staff members served as consultants to the various budget panels. This practice was halted temporarily, by mutual agreement, during the period that BASPC conducted a study of new directions for UBAC.

In his address to corporate members at the annual meeting in June 1969,¹⁹ Mortimer Fleishhacker, BASPC President, reported that the agency had completed 14 major studies in its 3-1/2 years of existence.

^{19/} "Looking Ahead," address by Mortimer Fleishhacker, President, BASPC, June 5, 1969.

Half of the citizen-directed studies were local in nature, the others regional. In addition, 27 factual reports had been produced by staff and dealt with matters raised by funding bodies such as UBAC and by governmental instrumentalities. He reported further that BASPC had held five major forums, conventions or conferences during the period, all of which were addressed to questions of public interest - adult and juvenile offenders returning to the community, problems of the aging, etc.

BASPC studies examined a variety of human services problems. The studies also varied in their focus, and included examination of specific problems (e.g., services for inmates of the San Mateo County Jail), of fields of service (e.g., boys' clubs, suicide prevention), and of problems of broader nature (e.g., unmarried mothers).

All BASPC studies* were conducted by volunteer committees, with appropriate staff support. In carrying out its commitment to objectivity, BASPC study committees were comprised of community leaders who had no involvement in the problem under consideration, and who could examine the issues from a disinterested viewpoint. Staff was assigned responsibility for facilitating the work of the committees, including development of materials for committee review, such as study plans, factual background documents and drafts of the committee's final report. The volunteer leaders directed staff activities, analyzed the information collected, held hearings as necessary, and developed recommendations designed to resolve or alleviate the problem under consideration. Because BASPC was

* There was one exception. In 1967, BASPC was requested to examine the Family Rehabilitation Center in Marin County. Because of the need for expeditious review of this matter, BASPC's President authorized staff to conduct the study and submit a "consultant's report" containing BASPC staff findings and recommendations.

committed to improving the health and welfare system, the study committees also were charged with responsibility for developing a plan for implementation of their recommendations.

Implementation of study recommendations often was a difficult task. The task was made more difficult because, in many instances, the studies were "self-initiated," that is, they were undertaken on behalf of the community, rather than in response to requests from "legitimate" parties at interest - boards or other bodies that were in a position to effect changes recommended by BASPC. Later analysis of BASPC activities revealed that the record of success for implementation of recommendations was far greater for studies undertaken on behalf of legitimate "clients" than for "self-initiated" studies.

The most significant example of a client-requested study during this period was BASPC's examination of the San Francisco Juvenile Court. This was not the first client-requested project to be undertaken by BASPC, although it proved to be one of the most successful in terms of implementation of recommendations. But the study was initiated under adverse conditions - operation of the San Francisco juvenile justice system was a highly charged issue at the time, other organizations had been suggested to conduct a study, and BASPC's involvement in the study was strongly opposed by the Golden Gate Chapter of NASW, the San Francisco Psychological Association and the San Francisco Bar Association. In spite of these factors, the San Francisco Council of BASPC voted to proceed with the study on behalf of the San Francisco Juvenile Justice Commission.

The decision to proceed with the study demonstrated that the agency's leadership was willing to deal with controversial issues in the

community, even under the most adverse of conditions. More importantly, however, the study process and the results of that process (the study was completed in June 1969) demonstrated that BASPC was, indeed, prepared to fulfill its role as an objective third party, concerned with developing feasible solutions to health and social services problems in the Bay Area.

A second major study undertaken during the period was the study of New Directions for UBAC, initiated in late 1968. Early in 1968, UBAC had requested staff assistance from BASPC in connection with such a study (see page 30). BASPC conferred with UBAC leadership and succeeded in (1) expanding the scope of the study to reflect the significance of the issues of concern to UBAC and (2) securing agreement to have the study conducted by BASPC. This study was of significance because it represented an opportunity for BASPC to play a key role in assisting UBAC to determine its fund raising and allocating policies for the future. It also represented the greatest commitment of staff time in a BASPC study during the 11 years of the agency's existence. The study took two years to complete; virtually every member of the professional staff of 27 had some involvement in the study process.

Finally, in 1967 BASPC produced a Directory of Health and Welfare Services in the Bay Area. This document was designed as a resource guide for agencies and individuals in identifying various public and private nonprofit health and welfare services available in each of the five counties. The Directory represented the most comprehensive document of its kind. Some 6,000 copies were distributed, at cost, to public and private agencies and to individuals in the Bay Area.

Staff

During the period 1967-1969, the BASPC staff complement remained at 27 professional persons. The agency experienced considerable turnover of professional staff, however. Several factors accounted for this turnover. Some persons hired from the predecessor organizations did not operate at the consistently high level of quality required by the Executive Director; others did not subscribe to the new style of operation being pursued by BASPC; and several persons advanced to better positions. In addition, efforts were being made to develop a staff representing a broad range of knowledge and experience. By mid-1969, these efforts had resulted in a staff complement consisting of persons with professional training in social work, public health, public administration, psychology, sociology, law and urban studies.

III. A CHANGE IN STYLE: 1970-JUNE 1975

The first years of BASPC operation were occupied with efforts to carry out the spirit, as well as the letter, of the Solomon Committee report. The concept of a regional planning organization was difficult for some to accept. The style of operation, the respective roles of volunteers and staff, the types of activities undertaken were considerably different from that which the corporate leadership - and the community - had known. The volunteers, therefore, were occupied with efforts to reconcile differences in philosophy of community planning. At the same time, volunteers and staff were testing and evaluating the BASPC approach to resolution of human services problems.

In 1970, significant changes began to take place in the organization and operation of BASPC finances, organizational structure, program activities and staffing. Those changes were brought about primarily as a result of modifications in the relationship with UBAC.

RELATIONSHIP WITH UBAC

In 1970, BASPC received an allocation of \$568,000 from UBAC, the same amount as had been received in previous years. The allocation represented some \$90,000 less than BASPC had requested for the year. In notifying BASPC of its allocation, UBAC's President encouraged BASPC to obtain funds from county governments other than San Mateo. In addition, he indicated UBAC's recognition that its allocation to BASPC was for BASPC's planning activities in the general community, as well as for its assistance directly to UBAC.²⁰

^{20/} Letter from Robert Harris, President of UBAC, to Arthur R. Hellender, President of BASPC, February 27, 1970.

The reduced allocation from UBAC, coupled with the failure to generate financial support from county governments other than San Mateo County, brought to fruition a situation about which the BASPC Board had expressed concern in previous years, namely, the necessity to institute major economies.

A balanced budget for 1970 was adopted by the BASPC Board on January 14, 1970. The budget was based on a significant reduction in the staff complement. Seven vacancies - three professional and four clerical - were to remain unfilled; and five staff members - three professional and two clerical - were to be terminated. Reduction of the professional staff from 27 to 21 persons eliminated the information and referral service (which was later operated under UBAC auspices), eliminated the position of Public Relations Director and restricted the availability of planning consultants to conduct program activities.

BASPC's financial situation was exacerbated when the County of San Mateo terminated its \$32,000 annual allocation, effective June 30, 1970. The action was based on the fact that the County had decided to contract for services as needed, rather than to provide a subsidy for BASPC.

Negotiations for 1971

Budget deliberations for calendar 1971 proved to be the most significant and far-reaching in the short history of BASPC. In late October 1970 BASPC transmitted a proposed income and expense budget for 1971 to UBAC's Finance Committee. The budget called for a UBAC allocation of \$527,929, sufficient to maintain the same staff complement as in 1970. Accompanying the budget was a document²¹ describing services that BASPC

21/ Proposed Services to UBAC in 1971, October 1970.

proposed to provide UBAC in 1971. On November 5, BASPC representatives, meeting with UBAC's Finance Committee, were notified that BASPC's allocation for 1971 would be \$200,000, plus a guarantee of \$50,000 for purchase of additional services. The BASPC representatives rejected the proposed reduction and objected to the manner in which the UBAC-BASPC partnership was being changed. Arthur R. Hellender, BASPC President, reminded the members of the UBAC Finance Committee that any change in the partnership arrangement was a policy matter requiring board consideration, and was not action which could be taken by UBAC's Finance Committee.

In a letter to BASPC dated November 25, 1970, UBAC's President stated that no change was contemplated in the partnership arrangement between the organizations; were any changes to be made in the working agreement, the matter would ultimately come before UBAC's Board of Directors. A series of joint board level and staff discussions followed, culminating in a meeting on December 11, 1970. At that meeting UBAC and BASPC leaders agreed that: the BASPC retainer from UBAC would be \$400,000 for 1971; henceforth, the UBAC allocation to BASPC would be considered a base retainer not to be reduced by outside income generated through fees for service; the \$400,000 annual allocation would be provided by BASPC for a period of two years, after which time UBAC would review the retainer arrangement; such review would determine whether the retainer was to be increased, reduced or remain the same; BASPC would continue to provide planning, research and consultation services to UBAC; UBAC would provide more direct services to its member agencies, particularly in the area of management and accounting services; UBAC support makes possible a citizen led planning agency for the Bay Area, but cannot underwrite the full cost

of services to governmental units and agencies. These agreements were ultimately included in a document adopted by both boards early in 1971.²²

The Statement was based upon "(a) recognition of the need for more direct involvement by UBAC with its member agencies to help them carry out decisions made by UBAC, and (b) recognition of BASPC as, primarily, a research and planning organization whose regional and local efforts in voluntary planning are supported by UBAC, in order that both UBAC and the wider community might avail themselves of its services."²³ The Statement also indicated that UBAC would provide BASPC with an annual retainer ". . . to ensure the existence of an independent, voluntary planning organization in the five-county Bay Area." The retainer was considered to be base support, rather than a purchase of specific services. The retainer, however, was not intended to underwrite the full cost of BASPC services to the community. Such services were to be provided on a fee-for-service basis, when appropriate.

The agreement specified that BASPC would make available to UBAC, upon request: citizen committee reports and recommendations; consultant's reports; staff consultation; and admissions reports.

The consultant's report represented a new type of BASPC activity. Heretofore, all reports which presented recommendations were produced through the deliberation of citizen committees. Staff reports included only facts. However, BASPC staff had learned that some UBAC volunteers on committees and panels were critical of the fact that BASPC staff reports

^{22/} A Statement of the Working Relationship Between the United Bay Area Crusade and the Bay Area Social Planning Council, February 25, 1971.

^{23/} Ibid.

lacked judgments or recommendations for UBAC action. In developing the joint statement with UBAC, BASPC suggested the additional type of report.

Memorandum of Understanding

UBAC decisions in late 1971 regarding support of BASPC led to year-long conferences, discussions, deliberations and confrontations. In November 1971, the BASPC Board adopted a budget based on receipt of \$400,000 from UBAC, in accordance with the joint agreement concluded earlier in the year. However, the UBAC campaign during the fall of 1971 raised some 12 percent less than the previous year. BASPC, therefore, was notified that its allocation would amount to \$352,000, a reduction of 12 percent. Although UBAC's total allocation to member agencies was reduced by 12 percent, individual agencies received varying amounts; some received increased allocations.

BASPC leaders initiated discussions with UBAC leadership early in 1972, in efforts to adjust the allocation. Harry R. Schroeter, President of BASPC, expressed concern about: UBAC's commitment to BASPC's future and to the conduct of community-wide planning; confusion in the community about the respective roles of the two organizations; and deteriorating relationships between UBAC and BASPC. Nevertheless, the amount of the retainer was not changed.

The BASPC Board finally adopted a revised budget for 1972, based on the reduced UBAC allocation. The budget was adopted, however, with the understanding that it would apply only so long as the reduced income situation obtained in 1972. The Board supported continued efforts to seek adjustment of the allocation.

Negotiations between UBAC and BASPC began in February and con-

tinued through the year. During discussion at a meeting in April, UBAC and BASPC representatives agreed to authorize the respective executive directors to draft a document describing the relationship between the two agencies. A Memorandum of Understanding Between the United Bay Area Crusade and the Bay Area Social Planning Council was prepared and presented at a meeting on May 26. The draft reiterated much of the 1971 Statement of Working Relationship regarding roles and functions of the respective organizations and their relationship. In addition, however, it described specific types of services that BASPC would provide to UBAC, upon request. Further, it stated that BASPC would provide consultation to budget panels and committees staffed by UBAC.*

The key portion of the draft document was the last page, which stipulated the retainer arrangement. The draft stated:

It is agreed that: (1) UBAC will provide BASPC with an annual retainer, on a non-deficit financing basis; (2) the amount will reach \$_____ per year in a three-year period starting January 1973, contingent upon campaign production; (3) the 1972 retainer will be \$_____. It is understood that BASPC will continue to charge fees for its services to other organizations and governmental bodies at a level commensurate with the work to be performed and the clients' ability to pay. UBAC-supported agencies will continue to be charged markedly reduced fees, and special allowances will be made when necessary.

The Memorandum appeared to be satisfactory to representatives of the two organizations. Unresolved, however, were the specific financial arrangements. On June 13, BASPC's President wrote to the President of UBAC, suggesting a three-year financing arrangement of \$450,000 for 1973, \$525,000 for 1974 and \$600,000 for 1975.

* This activity had been "temporarily" withdrawn during the period of the New Directions study. BASPC proposed to provide such services in 1971, but the proposal was not accepted by UBAC.

On July 10, BASPC leadership met to discuss the lack of response from UBAC. A decision was made to set a deadline for response from UBAC, and, failing an adequate response, to begin phase-out of BASPC operations. This decision was communicated to UBAC in a letter dated July 11, 1972.

In response to BASPC's action, Lee Ham, Vice Chairman of the UBAC Board was assigned responsibility for negotiations with BASPC. He and Mortimer Fleishhacker, BASPC's representative, met on July 21. After considerable discussion, agreement was reached to adopt a financial arrangement proposed by Mr. Ham, namely: that BASPC would receive an annual base retainer of \$400,000 starting in January 1973; that the annual amount would reach \$500,000 in a three-year period, contingent upon campaign production; that BASPC would submit quarterly reports reflecting the services provided to the UBAC Board, its committees, its agencies and the community at large; that a method would be developed for budgeting the retainer to reflect anticipated expenditures in the four areas of service, but that the retainer was not to change in the event that actual expenditures in any of the areas of service was less than anticipated; and that UBAC-supported agencies were to receive services free of charge, except under certain specified circumstances.

BASPC's Board approved the Memorandum "in principle" on August 2, 1972. However, UBAC's negotiating team and Finance Committee rejected the proposed agreement. In response, Mr. Schroeter wrote to Peter E. Haas, UBAC President on August 31. In reporting that the BASPC negotiating team had rejected the UBAC response to the proposed Memorandum, he stated:

It is inadequate because it ignores seven months of serious negotiations by the leadership of both organizations that culminated in an agreement between two reasonable men who had

"full authority" to act on behalf of our respective organizations. Nor does the UBAC response take into account the firm intent of our Board of Directors to remain independent, a principle concurred in orally and repeatedly by your representatives at the various meetings we've held over the past seven months. To compromise our independence further (beyond that already contained in the Ham-Fleishhacker Memorandum) is to deceive the community, its agencies and the Bay Area citizens who decreed, in the Citizens Survey Committee Report of 1965, the importance of a regional, independent social planning council in the San Francisco Bay Area.

The letter concluded with hope that the UBAC Board would act on the Memorandum at its September meeting.

UBAC took no action on the Memorandum of Understanding in September. However, it approved a recommendation from its Finance Committee ". . . that an allocation to Bay Area Social Planning Council for 1973 be set at this time at \$350,000. This represents a projected total of \$450,000, less \$100,000 carry-over surplus and anticipated earnings. This earlier-than-usual allocation on a one-year basis is based on a minimum campaign production of \$15,100,000; if campaign produces less than this amount, there would be a proportionate reduction, as would be the case with all agencies, including UBAC, as well."²⁴ In a separate action, the Board voted to ask the Finance Committee to reappraise the allocation figure should the campaign production exceed the 1971 figure.

A week following the UBAC Board meeting, UBAC reported to the community that "The Board approved a new Memorandum of Understanding with the Bay Area Social Planning Council for 1973 . . . A gross operating budget of \$450,000 is anticipated, with UBAC providing an allocation of

^{24/} Memorandum from Ruth Venuto, Secretary to UBAC's Executive Vice President, to Harry R. Schroeter, BASPC President, September 14, 1972.

\$350,000."²⁵

In continuing efforts to resolve the issue of UBAC-BASPC relationships, Mr. Haas, Mr. Ham and James P. Mergens, UBAC's Executive Vice President, were invited to meet with the BASPC Board on November 8, 1972. Following extensive discussion, agreement was reached that Mr. Ham and Mr. Fleishhacker would meet again to reconsider the Memorandum.

A new draft of the Memorandum was prepared and was approved by the UBAC and BASPC Boards on January 10, 1973. The final version provided for a base retainer for BASPC of \$350,000 per year starting in January 1973, and subject to reevaluation based on campaign results for allocation in 1973. The 1974 retainer was set at \$400,000 contingent upon campaign production and subject to UBAC's quarterly evaluation of performance of BASPC's work during 1973. The remaining provisions of the retainer arrangement were identical with those of the draft of August 2, 1972.

Later in the year, UBAC eliminated from its Board representation from BASPC. BASPC thereafter took similar action with regard to UBAC representatives. The practice of overlapping Board membership, in force since 1966, thereby was terminated.

Implementation of New Directions

While deliberations were proceeding between UBAC and BASPC during 1972, UBAC's Concentrated Services Committee was pursuing efforts at implementing a "new direction" for the agency. In mid-year, UBAC requested BASPC assistance with Concentrated Services planning in San Mateo, San Francisco and Marin Counties. BASPC responded that increased demands

^{25/} A Special Report, United Bay Area Crusade, Volume 1 - Number 7, September 21, 1972.

for BASPC services, coupled with a reduced allocation from UBAC, did not permit BASPC to meet that request. Rather than increase its allocation to BASPC so that the requested services might be provided, UBAC's Concentrated Services Committee developed a Request for Proposal to develop a comprehensive plan for neighborhood services in San Francisco; a fee of \$18,000 was available for the project. BASPC was one of several consulting organizations invited to submit a proposal to carry out the work. The BASPC Board reluctantly authorized the development of a proposal. Subsequently, in compliance with the recommendation of an independent selection committee, BASPC was awarded the contract.

UBAC Liaison Committee

In accordance with the Memorandum of Understanding, BASPC received an allocation of \$350,000 for calendar 1973 and \$400,000 for 1974. During 1974, UBAC's fiscal year was changed to the 12-month period beginning in July. As a result, the fiscal arrangement with BASPC was extended to June 30, 1975; BASPC received an allocation of \$200,000 for the period January-June.

Beginning in 1973, BASPC submitted quarterly reports to UBAC, indicating how its allocation was being expended. During 1973, 1974 and the first six months of 1975, the expenditures were divided as follows: one-half for services to UBAC, including its Board, committees and member agencies; one-half for services to the community. Beginning in July 1975, services to UBAC agencies were provided with funds allocated to the community, thus increasing the proportion available to UBAC itself.

Early in 1973, UBAC established a Social Planning Liaison Committee to work with BASPC; Mr. Lee Ham was appointed Chairman. BASPC repre-

sentatives met with the Committee in late April. The agenda for the meeting included: review of the Memorandum of Understanding; BASPC procedures for handling requests for service; BASPC services available to agencies, UBAC and the community; and a summary of UBAC requests for BASPC services in 1972.

The meeting resulted in the following agreements: that UBAC would be responsible for determining the method of expenditure of its allocation to BASPC for service to the UBAC Board, UBAC committees and UBAC agencies; that UBAC would inform its member agencies that agency requests for BASPC service were to be submitted to and screened by UBAC's Liaison Committee (heretofore, requests had been submitted directly to BASPC), except that agencies wishing to pay for BASPC services could submit requests directly to BASPC; that the Liaison Committee would inform BASPC in the near future as to how the remainder of UBAC's allocation for 1973 was to be spent; and that UBAC's allocation to BASPC would continue to be expended in salaries and non-personnel costs, regardless of whether requests for service were forthcoming.

In August 1974, UBAC's Liaison Committee was disbanded. The reason for that action was that UBAC had adopted a goal on planning and had appointed a task force to develop a program to implement that goal. Responsibility for evaluating and redefining UBAC's relationship with BASPC was assigned to that task force.

Task Force on Planning

The UBAC Task Force on Planning, under the chairmanship of Robert Pitts, conducted several months of deliberations during the latter part of 1974 and the first months of 1975. BASPC was among several re-

sources to which the Task Force turned for information and suggestions.

The report²⁶ of the Task Force was submitted to the President of United Way of the Bay Area (UWBA, changed from UBAC earlier in the year) on May 6, 1975. The recommendations deal with establishing a planning mechanism within UWBA, including staff, an ad hoc planning council whose function would eventually be absorbed by the Admissions and Allocations Committee, and planning bodies in each of the five counties. It was estimated that approximately one year would be required to make the system fully operational.

The Task Force recommended that UWBA continue its relationship with BASPC as the principal source to provide a research capability, and suggested that BASPC be ". . . funded annually based upon UWBA's projected need for research and the price quoted by BASPC for the studies to be performed. A suitable contingency should be included in this research budget to allow UWBA to request additional research studies as the need arises during the projected year."²⁷

The report also describes the suggested role of BASPC in relationship to United Way, as follows:

The Role of BASPC

The Bay Area Social Planning Council (BASPC) would continue to serve as the research arm of UWBA. One of the functions of the Planning and Budgeting Committee would be to define annually specific research studies to be performed by BASPC. Over a period of time, arrangements with BASPC would operate on a fee basis. The Planning and Budgeting Committee, on the basis of annually determined research programs, "priced out" by BASPC, could better determine its allocations. Moreover, BASPC would

²⁶/ Report of United Way of the Bay Area Task Force on Planning, May 1975.

²⁷/ Ibid, p. 5.

also be in a better position to develop its program plans for the ensuing year.²⁸

In a memorandum dated May 6, 1975, to the UWBA Board of Directors, Mr. Pitts stated that the Task Force recommended an allocation of \$400,000 to BASPC for the 1975-76 fiscal year. The memorandum went on to state:

It is understood that a major portion of this allocation will be used to finance BASPC's responsibility in the implementation of the planning process recommended by the Task Force on Planning.

We recommend that, included in the evaluation process proposed in the report, in early 1976 an examination of the first six months' experience of the United Way/BASPC relationship be made prior to establishing a different working relationship for the 1976-77 fiscal year.

The BASPC Board, on May 21, 1975, conducted an extensive discussion of the Task Force Report and the Pitts memorandum. Justice Richard M. Sims, Jr., BASPC President, presented a statement he had prepared following a meeting with several BASPC officers. He noted that adoption of the Task Force recommendations would produce abandonment of the partnership relationship envisioned in the 1965 Solomon Committee Report, and that UWBA was preparing to restore county organizations after having caused the demise of such organizations under BASPC because of inadequate financing. He identified the following issues requiring explanation by UWBA: clarification of the different working relationship contemplated for the 1976-77 fiscal year, and the criteria to be used in making the contemplated examination; the extent to which UWBA is prepared to underwrite internal research and planning for its agencies, and the procedures by which such services would be screened and assigned priorities; and the willingness and ability of UWBA to underwrite research and planning for

28/ Ibid, p. 9

nonmember voluntary nonprofit furnishers of human services who cannot pay any or the full costs of services desired.

The Board agreed to empower the Executive Committee to prepare for transmittal to UWBA a position paper clearly delineating the issues of concern to BASPC. The Board also responded to the recommendations regarding BASPC funding for 1975-76 by directing the President to " . . . convey to Mr. Moore, UWBA President, the sense of this Board that the UWBA allocation to BASPC for 1975-76 be divided as follows: one-half to UWBA for purposes to be specified by that organization; and one-half to be used at the discretion of the BASPC Board of Directors."²⁹

BASPC and UWBA Presidents met on June 3. At that time, UWBA's President indicated that BASPC's proposed arrangement for expending its allocation from UWBA was a reasonable one and should be followed until other arrangements are developed.

ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGES

Between January 1970 and June 1975, BASPC underwent a number of changes in organization and operation. Modifications were implemented in structure and style of operation, in policies and practices regarding finances, in staffing and in program activities.

Structure and Style of Operation

In May 1973, the BASPC Board received the report of a Bylaws Review Committee. The Committee had been charged with making specific changes in the Bylaws, such as officially changing the name of the agency to Bay Area Social Planning Council (from Bay Area Council for Social

^{29/} Minutes, BASPC Board of Directors Meeting, May 21, 1975.

Planning), and eliminating service on the Board of representatives from UBAC. The Committee reported that it also had discussed need for a review of the role and status of the County Councils. Concern about County Council functions had been expressed periodically throughout the history of BASPC. The Committee report suggested that the subject was of sufficient importance to warrant separate attention by a special committee. Later that year, BASPC's President appointed a Special Committee, chaired by Arthur Hellender, to examine the state and nature of BASPC, including the role and function of the County Councils.

In his Presidential Address to the Annual Meeting of the BASPC Corporation in June 1973, Harry R. Schroeter laid the groundwork for the work of the Special Committee. He identified six "facts of life" that, in his view, must be taken into account in considering the future of BASPC:

1. There has been a significant proliferation of citizen-directed planning instrumentalities organized under governmental agencies, or financed by government, in the past 10 years.
2. There has been a trend in the last five years toward the establishment of an in-house professional social planning capability within governmental and private organizations.
3. BASPC can no longer be "all things to all people."
4. It is not possible, any longer, to take the posture of an objective, third party on the one hand and be an advocate on behalf of the "community" or the "agencies" on the other.
5. There is a clear and continuing need for a planning organization in the Bay Area with substantial capacity for independent research and evaluation, as well as for program planning and consultation.
6. BASPC must continue to give its clients a choice of products.

The deliberations of the Special Committee were conducted during the fall of 1973. Its report was presented to the Board in January 1974.

The Committee reported the following findings:

1. That the Bay Area health and welfare community into which the BASPC was launched in 1966 has undergone significant change during the past eight years.
2. That the close partnership arrangement between UBAC and BASPC, as proposed by the Solomon Committee Report of 1965, has not been and may not be a feasible one.
3. That BASPC is able to provide only 40 percent of the volume of research and planning services proposed by the 1965 Solomon Committee Report, due to a significantly reduced allocation from UBAC and continued inflationary pressures.
4. That the Policy on Fee Charging adopted by the Board of Directors in 1971 has resulted in a steady increase in income for BASPC.
5. That the role originally proposed for BASPC's County Councils has been, to a large extent, preempted by newly emergent planning instrumentalities at the city, county and regional level.
6. That there is within BASPC at least two basically different points of view as to the approach and style BASPC should take in providing future research and planning services to the community.³⁰

The Committee concluded that the division of thought within BASPC as to its appropriate planning role required the development of a policy statement clearly establishing the basic style and operating policies of the agency. Further, it recognized that the role originally assigned to the County Councils ". . . is a continuing source of confusion and frustration within the organization and should be modified to conform with BASPC's present methods of operation, staff resources and the expectations of the community."³¹

30/ Report of the Special Committee, January 4, 1974.

31/ Ibid.

The Committee, therefore, presented two recommendations: that the Board adopt a policy statement prepared by the Committee; and that the role assigned to the County Councils be consistent with that policy statement.

On March 20, 1974, the BASPC Board adopted the Committee recommendations with minimal changes. The policy statement includes the following points: that BASPC was created to provide research, consultation and planning services to the voluntary and governmental health and welfare sectors in the community; that its style of operation is that of an objective, third party; that its services - research, program planning, program evaluation, proposal development, management consultation and technical assistance - are available to policy-making boards, agency executives, fund-raising organizations, foundations and community organizations; that BASPC is a viable alternative to other sources of research and planning services in the community, including government and commercial firms; that, although UBAC represents the basic source of financing, the future growth and development of BASPC as an independent organization rests on its ability to provide a quality service and to obtain support from the variety of clients it is available to serve; and that BASPC reserves the right to study on a carefully selected basis problems and issues of overriding significance to the community or to the Board of Directors.

The role and functions of the County Councils, as adopted by the Board, were:

1. to provide advice and consultation to and make recommendations to the Program Committee regarding possible BASPC activities;
2. to serve as a nucleus for study committees which are con-

vened, as necessary and appropriate, to report on specific community problems;

3. to provide advice and consultation to BASPC staff as necessary during the development of BASPC reports;
4. to encourage agencies and organizations in the Bay Area to utilize the research and planning resources of BASPC;
5. to undertake such other activities as may be delegated to the County Councils by the Board of Directors and which conform with the principles and policies of the corporation.³²

Further, the County Councils were reduced from 30 members to a maximum of 20 members, and a minimum of 15, and were to be appointed by the President.

These actions gave formal affirmation to the style of operation that BASPC had been conducting with increasing regularity since 1971. It also recognized the reduced role played by the County Councils in the organization. Nevertheless, Board and County Council members continued to raise the issue of the role and functions of the County Councils.

Following adoption of the Special Committee Report, the County Councils became moribund. In May of 1975, the San Francisco Council determined that there did not appear to be a reason for continuing and voted to recommend to the Board that it cease to operate. The Council submitted with its recommendation a Position Paper prepared by John Boyce-Smith, Chairman of the Council. The paper suggested the need for County Councils in each of the five counties to address the unmet human services needs of the community, and identified specific functions for the Councils. Finally, it was suggested that Council membership consist of persons with the time, commitment and interest to devote to Council activities; agency pro-

^{32/} Bylaws of the Bay Area Social Planning Council, as amended November 20, 1974.

fessionals were excluded on the basis of potential conflict of interest.

In discussing his Position Paper at the Board meeting on May 21, 1975, Mr. Boyce-Smith concluded that implementation of the report of UWBA's Task Force on Planning precluded the need for BASPC County Councils. The recommendation of the San Francisco Council and the Position Paper were referred to BASPC's Executive Committee for consideration.

Finances

One of the most significant changes in BASPC operation was instituted in May of 1971, when the Board adopted a document entitled Policy on Fee Charging. The Policy was developed as part of an effort to implement the agreement with UBAC to charge fees for service whenever appropriate. Appropriateness of a fee was to be determined by the BASPC President and the Chairman of the Program Committee; the amount of the fee was left to the President and the Executive Director. The fee was to be based on the estimated cost to BASPC of the project, and factors such as the availability to the client of special funds for research and planning, and the total budget of the requesting agency.

The fee charging policy was implemented immediately. During the seven months of 1971 following adoption of the policy, BASPC realized some \$7,000 in fees for its services. Fee income rose steadily in the years which followed: \$28,000 in 1972; \$49,000 in 1973; \$82,000 in 1974; and \$81,000 in 1975. Almost three fourths of BASPC's fee income was derived from projects conducted on behalf of governmental entities; a little less than 20 percent was realized from services to UBAC agencies.

Some time later, in January 1973, the Board, for the first time, authorized staff to develop a proposal to provide services outside the

five-county Bay Area. The Board action stipulated, however, that such efforts could be pursued ". . . as long as the proposal contains a bid covering the full cost of the BASPC services and the Program Committee is satisfied that the results of the proposed service (such as project evaluation) might have a positive impact on services or programs within the five-county Bay Area."³³

The relationship between UBAC and BASPC, including UBAC's financial commitment to support an independent planning organization, had been a matter of perennial concern to BASPC volunteer leadership and staff. Robert B. Shetterly, President of the Clorox Company and a member of the BASPC Board of Directors, proposed a solution to that issue in a presentation to the annual meeting of BASPC in June 1974.

Mr. Shetterly expressed the belief that planning for the orderly development and allocation of resources to resolve problems of greatest concern to the community can best be realized by an organization that is truly independent and broadly responsible to the community. Such an organization would be financed by a diverse group of community interests, including clients, corporate businesses, foundations and UBAC. He stated that BASPC might pursue such a course and suggested that the matter be considered seriously by BASPC's leadership.

Preliminary exploration was initiated into obtaining corporate financial support. The exploration, however, met without success, both during 1974 and again in 1976.

^{33/} Minutes, BASPC Board of Directors Meeting, January 10, 1973.

Staff Changes

In 1970, the BASPC staff consisted of 21 professionals. UBAC's reduced allocation for 1971 required that the staff be reduced further, to 15 professionals. In February of 1971, Martin B. Covitz, BASPC's Executive Director (appointed effective October 1, 1970) reorganized the staff, with the approval of the Board. The five County Director positions were eliminated and replaced by a team of three persons to serve the counties - two County Coordinators working under the direction of a County Operations Director. The team was assigned responsibility for servicing the County Councils, maintaining relationships with agencies in each county and coordinating BASPC activities in the counties.

In January 1971, the staff was consolidated into a single office in Oakland. This action was taken in accordance with the Board's decision in November 1970 to close the county offices. Major reasons for consolidation were to provide greater flexibility in staff deployment and to promote efficiency of services. This matter was presented initially to the Board in late 1969, but action had been deferred for a year to allow more extensive study. In closing the county offices, the County Councils were assured that services to the counties would continue and that the County Councils would convene as before, in their respective communities.

Staff size was reduced again in 1972, to 12 full-time professionals, as a result of UBAC's 12 percent reduction in the BASPC allocation and the termination by The San Francisco Foundation of its \$15,000 annual grant to BASPC. In 1973, however, increasing fee income permitted Alvin N. Taylor, BASPC's Executive Director (effective September 1, 1972) to employ part-time consultants with special expertise, to augment the ability of

staff to secure additional fee income.

Program Activities

During the first years of BASPC operation, decisions regarding local activities were made by the respective County Councils; decisions regarding regional activities fell under the jurisdiction of the Central and Regional Planning and Development Divisions, later called the Local and Regional Program Committee and finally the Program Committee. Reduction in the staff complement in 1970 and again in 1971, and the subsequent elimination of a full-time staff person assigned to each County Council, necessitated a change in the decision-making process regarding program activities.

No formal action was taken on this matter. However, during 1971, the Program Committee began to assume responsibility for decisions regarding intake of local, as well as regional, activities. At first, requests for local services were screened initially by the respective County Councils and recommendations for action were submitted to the Program Committee. Later, because of the need to move expeditiously on program matters, requests were cleared with the appropriate Council Chairman prior to review by the Committee.

Besides changing intake procedures, the nature of BASPC activities also changed markedly. Through the first five years of operation, the major BASPC product was the citizens' study report. In its 1971 agreement with UBAC, BASPC offered to provide, upon request, a new product - the consultant's report. Thereafter, BASPC was never again asked to produce a citizens' study report - by UBAC or any other client. The last request for such a report was received from UBAC in the fall of

1970. BASPC found that client agencies, including UBAC, were in need of facts about issues of concern to them; they might also be interested in the judgments of knowledgeable professionals about those issues. But both voluntary agencies and governmental entities relied on their own citizen groups - boards, committees, commissions, etc. - for decisions or advice.

Services to UBAC included consultant's reports, factual reports and technical assistance, including research. A major activity involved BASPC staff consultation to UBAC's Government Relations Committee. Research and technical assistance activities, including the development of several reports, were initiated in the fall of 1974 and continued through the early part of 1976.

A major project was the two-year study of New Directions, completed in October 1970. The study was carried out under the leadership of Robert Shetterly, President of the Clorox Company. The final report, entitled New Directions for the United Bay Area Crusade, constituted a brief policy statement, recommending that UBAC focus attention on services for the young, particularly the disadvantaged, and that \$3 million in new funds generated by UBAC be used to finance such services. The report was transmitted to UBAC as a policy statement; it was accompanied by supportive documents developed by the study committee during the course of its work.*

Following transmittal of the report, BASPC presented UBAC with a proposal to assist with implementation of the report and to provide con-

* During the summer of 1970, UBAC developed a new policy for the allocation of funds, the first step in New Directions activities.

sultation to budget panels. UBAC leadership decided to pursue its new directions activities without BASPC assistance.

In addition to serving UBAC, BASPC provided services to large and small agencies, voluntary and public, for full and partial fees or without cost. The Salvation Army, New Oakland Committee, Golden Gate Scouting, City of Martinez, Satellite Senior Homes, East Bay Regional Park District, California Office of Criminal Justice Planning, Metropolitan YMCA of Alameda County were among the many and varied clients served by the agency.

A milestone in BASPC activities was its study of alternatives to incarceration, conducted on behalf of the Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors. BASPC's Contra Costa County Council was responsible for generating the interest of the Board of Supervisors in engaging BASPC to undertake the study. Thereafter, staff and volunteer leaders proceeded with negotiations leading to a \$21,000 contract. That contract represented the first fee-producing project by BASPC on behalf of a County government, and its largest contract to that time.

In October 1972, after four months of data collection and analysis, BASPC produced a consultant's report entitled Alternatives to Incarceration and Proposed Improvements in the Jail System in Contra Costa County. The document presents a series of recommendations designed to divert offenders from jail and to improve programs for jail inmates. The report also presents recommendations regarding construction of new County Jail facilities.

The most significant client, from the standpoint of fee income, was the County of Alameda. In December 1973, BASPC obtained a contract

to evaluate 20 revenue sharing projects funded by the County; a contract to evaluate seven additional projects was obtained during the spring of 1974. In late 1974, the Alameda County Human Resources Agency awarded a contract to BASPC to conduct a study of priority needs of the elderly. Finally, early in 1975 BASPC again was hired, this time to evaluate a total of 46 revenue sharing projects. The four contracts with Alameda County realized approximately \$121,000 in fee income; the largest contract amounted to \$67,000.

During the five-year period June 1970 through May 1975, BASPC completed more than 100 studies and consultations on behalf of UBAC, UBAC agencies, independent agencies and governmental entities. About half of the projects were for UBAC; some 25 were for UBAC-supported agencies; 16 for government; and eight for independent voluntary agencies. In addition, BASPC staff continued to provide informal consultation and other types of short-term assistance to public and private agencies and organizations.

The services provided by BASPC established the organization's credibility in the community. Its style of operation continued to be criticized by some; and its objectivity, staff competence and quality of products were sometimes questioned. But the agency gained the respect of client agencies for its ability to provide timely, objective and high quality services. More importantly, BASPC efforts on behalf of client agencies led to numerous changes and improvements in the human services delivery system in the San Francisco Bay Area.

IV. THE FINAL MONTHS

Between July 1975 and December 1976, BASPC completed some 37 major projects; 12 were on behalf of UWBA. Approximately \$82,000 in fee income was realized from services provided to the various agencies and organizations not affiliated with UWBA.

Consideration of organizational matters also continued. In spite of the financial problems and the real threat to the continued existence of the agency, considerable attention was given concerns about the County Councils. In September 1975, the Board reviewed Bylaws amendments recommended by the Executive Committee, which earlier had been assigned responsibility for reviewing the role of the County Councils. One amendment changed the Councils to County Committees. Each Committee was to consist of the Vice President of the Corporation from that County, who would be Chairman, the members of the Board from that County and up to 15 other persons to be appointed by the President upon the recommendation of the County Chairman. Added to the functions of the Committees was sponsorship of meetings (annually) on human services problems in the community.

The proposed amendments were submitted to the County Councils for review. The San Mateo County Council unanimously opposed the amendments because they represented a downgrading of the Councils. The San Mateo County Committee, in a position statement³⁴ submitted to the Board, indicated that it wished to take an activist role regarding social and health

34/ Position Statement, San Mateo County Committee, BASPC (undated).

problems.

The proposed amendments were adopted by the Board nevertheless.

RELATIONSHIP WITH UNITED WAY

During the last 18 months of BASPC operation, BASPC Board and staff members continued to hold out hope that the viability of the agency could be preserved. UWBA's allocation to BASPC for the 1975-76 fiscal year was continued at the level of \$400,000. That amount came from a total of \$432,000 that UWBA had set aside for "social planning"; the remaining \$32,000 was to be used to begin development of UWBA's in-house planning component. Uncertainty about the implications of the report of the Task Force on Planning - UWBA's view of its relationship with BASPC, the level of financial support, restrictions on BASPC expenditures, and other issues - raised questions about the future of BASPC as an independent research and planning organization. The UWBA-BASPC relationship was discussed at every BASPC Board meeting during the period.

In August 1975, BASPC's President wrote to Fred Moore, UWBA President, regarding BASPC's understanding of the existing operating arrangements between the two organizations; the letter was in follow-up to an earlier meeting with Mr. Moore, and was in compliance with BASPC Board action taken in May. The letter included the recommendation of the BASPC Board that UWBA's allocation to BASPC for fiscal year 1975-76 be divided as follows: one-half to UWBA for purposes to be designated by that organization; and one-half to be used at the discretion of BASPC. Mr. Moore responded on October 24, indicating that UWBA was in agreement with the proposed arrangement. He also proposed that discussions regarding the

1976-77 allocation to BASPC start in January 1976, in the belief that ". . . early discussions will facilitate continued improvement in the relations between our organizations, and better planning for the use of our planning and research dollars."³⁵

BASPC received no word from UWBA regarding negotiations for four months. Part of the delay was attributed to the fact that UWBA's President had been transferred by his company and was commuting to the Bay Area for UWBA Board meetings during the last months of his term (ending February 20, 1976).

In the meantime, the BASPC Executive Director maintained communication with UWBA regarding the status of UWBA requests for BASPC services. By September 1975, BASPC reported that it had expended or committed \$100,000 for services requested by UWBA for the period July-December 1975. Most of the remaining \$100,000 for services to UWBA were being held in reserve to assist UWBA's new Planning Director with development of the in-house planning program.

Problems arose in the provision of services to UWBA when, in December, UWBA requested that two BASPC staff members be assigned to the UWBA Planning Director.³⁶ The request was based on the fact that the Planning Director did not yet have sufficient funds to employ staff necessary to carry out the recommendations of the UWBA Task Force on Planning; staff services, therefore, were to be purchased from BASPC, using funds allocated to BASPC for services to UWBA. BASPC agreed to the request, with

^{35/} Letter from Fred L. Moore, Jr., UWBA President, to Hon. Richard M. Sims, Jr., BASPC President, October 24, 1975.

^{36/} Letter from Fred L. Moore, Jr., UWBA President, to Hon. Richard M. Sims, Jr., BASPC President, December 9, 1975.

the stipulation that the project would constitute purchase of services, rather than the loan of staff; that BASPC staff assigned to the project would continue to be responsible to and work under the supervision of BASPC's Executive Director; and that BASPC staff services would be available through the end of the 1975-76 fiscal year.

A second request, for technical assistance to the UWBA Membership Committee, also was approved, with the exception that BASPC staff would not be responsible for keeping minutes of the Committee, as had been requested.

The BASPC Board expressed concern that United Way was asking BASPC to take on inappropriate tasks. The President of BASPC observed that ". . . we are 'walking a tightrope' in trying to accommodate the new United Way requests for BASPC services."³⁷

Discussion of the 1976-77 allocation to BASPC was initiated on February 17, 1976, when BASPC staff met with key staff of UWBA. At that meeting, UWBA's Executive Director stated that a recommendation would be presented to the UWBA Board on March 24, calling for an allocation of \$476,000 for planning and research for 1976-77. The allocation would be divided as follows:

- \$76,000 to support the UWBA planning staff
- \$200,000 to BASPC as a retainer for services to UWBA agencies, the community and UWBA committees
- \$200,000 to be set aside for use of the UWBA Ad Hoc Planning Committee for purchase of research services as required.*

^{37/} Minutes, BASPC Board of Directors Meeting, January 22, 1976.

* BASPC subsequently learned that the "recommendation" was, in fact, a UWBA staff proposal.

This information and observations about its implications were presented to BASPC's President.³⁸

In response to this development, Justice Sims, BASPC President, wrote to Gordon Hough, the new President of UWBA, requesting a meeting to discuss the situation. He also called a meeting of BASPC's Executive Committee. The Committee's position was transmitted to UWBA and states ". . . that it would be impossible to maintain a viable planning, research and consulting organization for UWBA and the community at large with a guaranteed income of only \$200,000."³⁹

A meeting was held with Mr. Hough on March 12. At that time he was informed ". . . that if there was no firm commitment of \$400,000, BASPC would have to request that the \$200,000 recommended by UWBA staff be allocated to BASPC for the first six months of the fiscal year so that the Board could liquidate in orderly fashion."⁴⁰ Following considerable discussion about the history of BASPC, UWBA-BASPC relationships and other relevant matters, agreement was reached that Mr. Hough would convene a meeting of knowledgeable leaders who had dealt with the UWBA-BASPC relationship in the past, current planning and finance committeemen and prospective leaders of UWBA, to evaluate the immediate situation and recommend an orderly procedure for future relations.

Subsequent to that meeting, UWBA's President appointed Thad Brown, UWBA Senior Vice President, to serve as chairman of a special committee

^{38/} Memorandum from Alvin N. Taylor, BASPC Executive Director, to Hon. Richard M. Sims, Jr., BASPC President, February 20, 1976.

^{39/} Letter from Hon. Richard M. Sims, Jr., BASPC President, to Gordon L. Hough, UWBA President, March 5, 1976.

^{40/} Minutes, BASPC Board of Directors Meeting, March 18, 1976.

to make recommendations regarding an allocation to BASPC for 1976-77.

The Committee convened a meeting with BASPC representatives on March 26; the tenor of the meeting was not friendly. On May 4, the Committee notified BASPC that the following recommendations would be presented to the UWBA Board of Directors:

1. That United Way allocate to BASPC \$150,000 for the period July 1 to December 31, 1976. The research needs of United Way and its committees should receive first priority in utilization of these dollars, but services to the community and United Way agencies could also be financed from this money.
2. That United Way retain a consultant firm to determine if the types of services offered by BASPC would conform to what we feel will be required in the needs assessment efforts necessary to support United Way's planning activities. The United Way allocation to BASPC for the period January 1 to June 30, 1977 (up to \$150,000) would depend upon the findings resulting from this study. The study should be completed as soon as possible, preferably no later than July 1, 1976.⁴¹

An immediate response was prepared by Justice Sims, criticizing the recommendations and pointing out that the implications of the special committee's recommendations were inconsistent with the report of the UWBA Task Force on Planning.⁴² Justice Sims also wrote to the UWBA President, stating:

I deeply regret that we were unable to meet with the knowledgeable leaders with whom we have treated in the past, because I believe we can demonstrate our worth to UWBA and the community. It is unfortunate that no one on the committee which was selected represented a UWBA committee or agency for whom we have rendered extensive services in the immediate past.

I would stress that in my opinion it is a waste of good

^{41/} Letter from Thad Brown, UWBA Senior Vice President, to Hon. Richard M. Sims, Jr., BASPC President, May 4, 1976.

^{42/} Letter from Hon. Richard M. Sims, Jr., BASPC President, to Thad Brown, UWBA Senior Vice President, May 12, 1976.

money to hire a consultant to evaluate the organization with whom one has shared relations for over ten years. I fear it is our existence per se, not the quality of our work, that is at stake.⁴³

On May 18, BASPC representatives met with the special committee, at the request of Mr. Brown. A revised proposal was presented, which provided for an allocation of \$300,000 to BASPC, to be budgeted as follows:

\$150,000 to provide research support for the planning function of United Way. The bulk of these funds to be expended on a needs assessment project.

\$75,000 for the research needs of United Way agencies and the general community.

\$75,000 for United Way itself and its committees.⁴⁴

Besides reducing the total allocation to BASPC, the proposal reduced the amount for services to United Way agencies and the community to \$75,000; \$125,000 had been allocated for such services in the 1975-76 fiscal year.

The proposal was approved by the UWBA Board on May 20, 1976.

In June, the BASPC Board approved a six-month budget based on an allocation of \$200,000 for the period July-December 1976. The action was taken following receipt of formal notification from United Way that such an arrangement was acceptable.

SEEKING OUTSIDE FINANCING

The BASPC Board was well aware of the need for financial support from sources other than UWBA. Such acknowledgement was evident from the

^{43/} Letter from Hon. Richard M. Sims, Jr., BASPC President, to Gordon L. Hough, UWBA President, May 12, 1976.

^{44/} Proposal for Allocation to Bay Area Social Planning Council, May 19, 1976.

earliest deliberations of the Board and through the years. The UWBA allocation for 1976-77 merely underscored the need for immediate action.

In April 1976, BASPC's President appointed a committee to explore new sources of income for BASPC. The first action of the Ad Hoc Committee was to accept an offer from Robert Shetterly to explore the possibility of direct corporate support. (Mr. Shetterly had been a member of the BASPC Board and, in 1974, had advocated such a move.)

On June 8, Mr. Shetterly and Justice Sims met with a group of corporate leaders to discuss UWBA-BASPC relationships and the need for a more diverse financial base for BASPC. The corporate leaders present agreed that BASPC should be retained as a viable organization; that UWBA should not dissipate its funds in building up similar resources; and that UWBA should continue to use BASPC resources as recommended by the Task Force on Planning. They were opposed, however, to direct contributions to BASPC. They appeared to be suggesting that BASPC obtain additional financing through sale of its services.

The Ad Hoc Committee convened again on June 9 and agreed to proceed with other potential sources of income, including foundations.

BASPC's Executive Director discussed possible foundation support with Martin A. Paley, Executive Director of The San Francisco Foundation. Mr. Paley expressed interest in providing a grant for BASPC to hire a consulting organization to conduct a marketing survey which would identify the most productive targets for fee income.

On June 17, the BASPC Board authorized staff to prepare a proposal for a foundation grant to purchase a third-party feasibility study of BASPC's potential for fee income. Staff also was authorized to prepare

a proposal to solicit foundation funds to develop a marketing capability within BASPC.

BASPC staff prepared and submitted a proposal to The San Francisco Foundation for a grant to conduct a marketing survey; the proposal included provision for funds to develop a marketing capability within BASPC in the event that the survey showed positive results. The Foundation approved a grant of \$12,700 for a marketing survey, with the stipulation that the funds be used to hire an outside consulting organization. The offer from The Foundation was discussed by the BASPC Board in September 1976.

During the summer months, BASPC's President contacted several organizations - Bay Area Council, Inc., Stanford Research Institute, and others - in efforts to secure new sources of income. These efforts were unsuccessful.

CLOSING THE DOORS

On September 16, 1976, the BASPC Board reviewed efforts of the previous months to secure funds from sources other than UWBA. The Budget and Finance Committee, in its report, concluded ". . . that United Way's continuing refusal to commit itself to funding BASPC for more than a year at a time, the difficulties of generating additional fee income, and the growing concern of BASPC employees over whether BASPC was going to 'continue in business' could no longer be ignored . . ." ⁴⁵ It was noted that the budget submitted for January-June 1977 provided for a full-time staff of five. Consideration had been given to BASPC's operating as do commercial

^{45/} Minutes, BASPC Board of Directors Meeting, September 16, 1976.

consulting firms, with a small core staff, hiring additional personnel as contracts are obtained. The Committee believed ". . . that BASPC was created as an organization with an in-place staff that could respond immediately to the needs of United Way or its member agencies. To duplicate the style of commercial firms did not seem appropriate."⁴⁶

The Finance Committee, in reviewing potential sources of subsidy, had found a willingness on the part of foundations to make grants to applicant agencies requiring BASPC assistance, but an unwillingness to provide an ongoing subsidy to make BASPC services available to agencies on a continuing basis.

Finally, in considering BASPC's application to The San Francisco Foundation, the Committee concluded that giving BASPC a grant to hire another consulting firm to conduct a marketing survey would in no way improve the agency's cash flow problem.

The Committee, on the basis of its findings, agreed to recommend the termination of BASPC. After considerable discussion, the Board adopted the following motion:

. . . that BASPC cease operations as of December 31, 1976, and take all necessary actions in the meantime to meet all financial commitments.⁴⁷

Following the Board's action, further program intake was halted and steps were taken to insure completion of those projects which were in progress.

BASPC's Executive Director formulated and carried out a plan for the orderly phase-out of the professional and clerical staff complement.

^{46/} Ibid.

^{47/} Minutes, BASPC Board of Directors Meeting, September 16, 1976.

On December 31, 1976, the operations of the Bay Area Social Planning Council were permanently terminated.

V. KEY ISSUES AFFECTING BASPC

The preceding chapters present a factual history of BASPC. They describe changes in its organization, staffing, program, financing and relationships with United Way during a period of eleven years. This chapter discusses key issues which confronted the agency and which helped to shape its destiny.

FINANCIAL SUBSIDY

BASPC was created as a community planning organization. Its operation was to be supported with funds from the United Way. During the early years, United Way funds were allocated for the general support of BASPC, UWBA's planning partner. In 1971, the markedly reduced allocation to BASPC was identified as a "retainer," to be used to provide specified services to United Way, as well as to the "community."

In 1973, the Memorandum of Understanding between the two organizations not only identified services that BASPC was to provide United Way, but required that quarterly reports be submitted to UWBA to account for BASPC's expenditure of the allocation. Arrangements for use of the monies provided that half of the allocation was to be expended on behalf of United Way and its agencies; only half was to be available for services to the community. Subsequently, United Way requested another shift in the allocation which reserved 50 percent of the funds for services to UWBA itself, with United Way agencies included under services to the community.

Finally, the UWBA Planning Task Force report recommended that funding

for BASPC be placed on a fee basis. The resultant allocation to BASPC, for 1976-77, not only was severely reduced once again, but provided that 75 percent of the funds be reserved for services requested by United Way.

The concept of a United Way subsidy for BASPC activities was all but dead.

Efforts to secure financial support from alternative sources, other than on a fee-for-service basis, were unsuccessful. The County of San Mateo and The San Francisco Foundation had provided general support for the agency during its first years of operation, but eventually terminated those arrangements. San Mateo County, and the other county governments approached for support, indicated that funding for BASPC would be available only for specific work that the counties might require. The San Francisco Foundation, in 1976, indicated a willingness to provide agencies with funds to hire BASPC, but declined to provide direct financing to BASPC as a retainer for services to community agencies.

Leaders of business and industry, too, while recognizing the importance of an independent research and consulting organization for the Bay Area, would not agree to provide general financial support for BASPC. Rather, they said, "Sell your services."

BASPC INDEPENDENCE

In 1965 the Solomon Committee recommended the creation of BASPC as an independent planning organization, in partnership with United Way. The independence of BASPC was never wholly accepted in some quarters.

Some United Way volunteer leaders were of the view that BASPC should be the planning arm within United Way. This view was consistent with the

arrangement in San Francisco prior to creation of BASPC. In that community, a Social Planning Department was operated within the United Community Fund (UCF). A Social Planning Committee of volunteers operated in much the same way as did the independent councils in the other four counties. However, the Committee was answerable to the UCF Board; Committee actions could be overturned by that Board.

These views about the relationship of the planning instrumentality with the fund-raising and allocating body were reflected in the attitudes and behavior toward BASPC. Such attitudes and behavior influenced to an extent decisions made by United Way leadership about matters affecting BASPC.

Nor was BASPC totally accepted or supported by some key United Way staff members. Relationships between the administrative staffs of the two organizations, while cordial initially, were generally strained from 1970 onward. Periodic requests for BASPC staff assistance indicated a lack of understanding of or failure to accept the role of an independent planning organization in relation to United Way. And various United Way staff members seemed at times bent on exerting close control over BASPC staff.

Independence also was an issue of concern to agencies in the community. Prior to the creation of BASPC, agency representatives, particularly professional staff members, participated actively on the local planning councils in their counties. They helped to influence activities of the councils. In addition, the Councils often provided a forum for discussion of mutual problems and concerns, and served as the public advocate on positions of interest to the agencies.

Creation of BASPC altered this arrangement. Most agency professionals were phased out of membership on the County Councils and on the BASPC Board, on the basis of potential conflict of interest and because of the position that the agency was to be directed by volunteers. Further, BASPC did not continue the practice of convening meetings of agency professionals or of conducting community forums, except for specific purposes. And BASPC terminated the practice of endorsing proposals, serving as the agencies' spokesman on various issues, and serving as an advocate of agencies with United Way. As a result, BASPC was the object of considerable criticism from some persons all through its eleven years of operation. Agencies that received BASPC services, however, generally were favorably impressed with the organization, even though some still expressed preference for "the good old days."

ROLE OF THE VOLUNTEER

At the outset, BASPC's volunteer leadership consisted of persons who had been active in predecessor organizations. These people, for the most part, had been accustomed to active participation in the planning process. However, the role of the volunteers in BASPC rapidly changed from direct participation to decision-making and policy-setting. As a result, many volunteers felt less involved - fewer committees, fewer meetings and different types of meetings. The Board, the County Councils and the ad hoc study committees focused more on reviewing issues and arriving at decisions, and less on forum-type discussions.

In 1971, with the introduction of the BASPC consultant's report, the citizens' study committee fell into disuse. BASPC volunteers found

that, given a choice, client agencies - including United Way - preferred BASPC staff judgments on problems and issues; the views of community leaders were available to them in the form of their own boards, committees, commissions, and other such bodies.

At the local level, the role of the County Councils was diminished, partly because of financial limitations, but also because of the changing nature of the organization. Besides their diminished capacity within BASPC, the Councils were bypassed as the "spokesman" of the community on social welfare issues. Ethnic groups, special interest groups and grass roots organizations appeared and began to speak for themselves.

The role of the volunteer in BASPC was never clearly established and defined to the satisfaction of the total corporate membership. The issue was raised periodically throughout BASPC's history. Even as the agency faced its final crisis, some members were expressing concern about the need for a more meaningful role for the County Councils.

OBJECTIVITY

Early in its operation, BASPC adopted the position of an objective "third party" in matters brought to its attention. Studies, consultations, public positions and other activities all were approached from an objective, disinterested standpoint to insure that the resulting decisions were based on careful and thorough analysis of all relevant facts.

The BASPC approach represented a change from the approach to social planning that many volunteers and professional staffs were accustomed to. Previously, the independent local planning councils periodically adopted positions on the basis of consensus or on the "rightness" of a particular

point of view. Programs were endorsed, causes were espoused, grant proposals were supported, often with little or no analysis of their merits. During the early years of operation, many BASPC volunteers were uncomfortable with the new approach to problems and issues. Agencies and organizations in the community, too, expressed frustration in not having the ready support or endorsement of BASPC. In 1973, BASPC's President stated that BASPC could not be both an objective third party and an advocate on behalf of the community or agencies. He suggested that trying to do both would destroy the agency's credibility for either role. Some BASPC volunteers and many agencies never subscribed to this view.

LOCAL AUTONOMY

In eleven years of operation, the definition of the role and functions of BASPC's County Councils was never fully resolved. This issue was discussed at length even during the last days of the agency.

When BASPC was organized, the previously independent local planning councils expected to continue operating as they had in the past. During the first years of operation, County Councils, in fact, had considerable autonomy. The Councils made decisions about BASPC program activities in their respective communities, had responsibility for local studies and consultations and their resulting reports, and exerted considerable control over staff in the county offices. However, as the BASPC program focus changed, and as the staff was reduced and reorganized as a result of funding cuts, the role of the County Councils diminished to the point that, at the last, consideration was given to disbanding the Councils (by then called Committees).

Many County Council members never ceased efforts to salvage the autonomy of BASPC's local instrumentalities. The operation of BASPC appeared to indicate that the matter of local autonomy had been settled early; in fact, the issue was a matter of discussion for eleven years.

CLIENT-FOCUSED ACTIVITIES

During the first years of operation, BASPC activities included studies of broad community problems - low income persons ineligible for public assistance, home care services, unmarried mothers, etc. This type of activity was based on the view that BASPC was a community planning organization and, therefore, was charged with responsibility to identify and resolve problems "on behalf of the community." The community studies conducted by BASPC were thorough and led to the development of many pertinent recommendations for change. However, BASPC efforts to implement those recommendations were not markedly successful. A major reason for difficulty in effecting change was that the agents of change (government bodies, commissions, agency boards) had not sought BASPC assistance, had no obligation to take BASPC advice, and did not necessarily concur with BASPC's view of the importance of the specific problems.

Eventually, BASPC activities focused more on providing services to specific clients, that is those agencies, boards, commissions, etc., that were in a position to effect changes and to resolve or alleviate the problems to be examined.

While BASPC volunteers subscribed to the client-focused approach, some were of the view that the program should not be limited to this approach. In fact, BASPC always reserved the right to study and take posi-

tions on issues which the agency itself deemed important. Positions actually were taken on several major public issues (e.g., public welfare and poverty).

Another view expressed was that BASPC should engage in broad community social welfare planning, just as other organizations conduct broad planning activities in other fields (e.g., criminal justice, health). Such an approach was never adopted, however, primarily because BASPC leaders recognized that the agency had no mandate to carry out such activities (as had agencies in other fields) and that BASPC did not "represent" the community.

Analysis of the history of BASPC will identify other issues which shaped the organization and operation of the agency. The issues discussed here, however, represent those that most affected the agency - whether strengthening the organization or contributing to its demise.

AFTERWORD

This history of the Bay Area Social Planning Council was prepared in order that students, teachers, practitioners in community planning and social welfare, community leaders and the community at large might have available a record of one effort to achieve an orderly approach to the development of health and social welfare services for the people in the five-county San Francisco Bay Area.

Perhaps the concept espoused by the Bay Area Social Planning Council did not succeed; perhaps it was only the agency itself that did not succeed. The question of how best to achieve the orderly development of resources to meet the needs of people will be left to others. It is to be hoped that, as efforts are undertaken in the future, appropriate consideration will be given to the history of BASPC. For, the visions of the future are born of the lessons from the past.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Address by Harry R. Schroeter, BASPC President, BASPC Annual Meeting, June 13, 1973.
- Appraisal of Federated Financing and Community Planning for Health and Welfare in the Bay Area, July 26, 1965.
- Articles of Incorporation of Bay Area Council for Social Planning, December 15, 1965.
- A Special Report, United Bay Area Crusade, Volume 1 - Number 7, September 21, 1972.
- A Statement of the Working Relationship Between the United Bay Area Crusade and the Bay Area Social Planning Council, February 25, 1971.
- Background Document for 1976-77 Funding Deliberations with the United Way of the Bay Area, January 1976.
- BASPC Annual Program Reports (1971 - 1976).
- BASPC: Past, Present, Future (Text of Slide Presentation Prepared for the Special Committee of the BASPC Board of Directors), October 19, 1973.
- BASPC Policy on Public Issues, August 9, 1966.
- BASPC Policy on Special Grant Projects, August 1966.
- Bylaws of the Bay Area Council for Social Planning, January 6, 1966; with amendments dated December 5, 1967, May 12, 1971, June 13, 1973, May 15, 1974, November 20, 1974, November 20, 1975.
- Final Report of the Study Committee on Bay Area Planning (unbound), August 21, 1964.
- History of the Bay Area Welfare Planning Federation, August 1955 - January 1966, Eva Hance, October 1971.
- "Looking Ahead," Address by Mortimer Fleishhacker, President, Bay Area Social Planning Council, June 5, 1969.
- Memorandum of Understanding Between the United Bay Area Crusade and the Bay Area Social Planning Council, January 10, 1973.
- Minutes, BASPC Board of Directors Meetings, January 1966 - November 1976.
- Position Statement, San Mateo County Committee, BASPC (undated).

77 03607

U.C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES



C123308565

- Proposal for Allocation to Bay Area Social Planning Council, May 19, 1976.
- Proposed Services to UBAC in 1971, October 1970.
- Remarks by Robert B. Shetterly to BASPC Annual Meeting, June 20, 1974.
- Report of the Special Committee to Review the State and Nature of BASPC (unbound), January 4, 1974.
- Report of United Way of the Bay Area Task Force on Planning, May 1975.
- Report on BASPC for the Period January 1966 - May 1968 (unbound), prepared by the Executive Director, May 3, 1968.
- Suggested Internal Structure for County Councils, August 9, 1966.

INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENTAL
STUDIES LIBRARY

AUG 12 2024

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

